

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1344783



The Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

HISTORY
OF
THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

VOLUME I.

BR
162
RG
1858
V. 1

HISTORY

OF

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

BY

JAMES CRAIGIE ROBERTSON, M.A.,

VICAR OF BEKESBOURNE, IN THE DIOCESE OF CANTERBURY.

VOL. I. (A. D. 64 — 590.)

SECOND EDITION.

LONDON:

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.

1858.

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

LONDON: PRINTED BY W. CLOWES AND SONS, STAMFORD STREET,
AND CHARING CROSS.

P R E F A C E

TO THE SECOND EDITION.

IN undertaking a History of the Church, my intention was merely to compile from some of the most esteemed works of earlier writers a narrative which might serve by way of introduction to the subject. It appeared to me that it might be possible thus to ascertain the necessary facts; that, coming to the task with some previous knowledge, and comparing together historians of various communions and opinions, I might escape the danger of blindly following the guidance of any; and that such a work as I meditated, however low it might be ranked, would be useful to English readers.

From the very outset, however, I found myself induced to extend my plan. The first volume was in great part derived immediately from the original sources; and, on proceeding to the continuation, I resolved to consult these in as far as they might be accessible to me—a resolution which, even if it had not been suggested by my own inclination, would almost have been forced on me, inasmuch as, for the time after the sixth century, there exists no such ample and trustworthy store of materials at second hand as that which has been provided for the earlier period by the conscientious diligence of Tillemont. Thus my work has in its progress assumed a more elaborate character,

and I have now endeavoured to bring the first volume into conformity with the second in this respect by throughout consulting and citing the original authorities.

In again sending forth this volume, it is a pleasure to acknowledge the many evidences which have lately appeared among us of an increased interest in the study which it is intended to promote; and among these evidences it cannot be invidious to advert especially to the publication and the reception of a work so prominent in the theological literature of our time as the "History of Latin Christianity" by the Dean of St. Paul's.

J. C. R.

*Bekesbourne, near Canterbury,
April 22, 1858.*

CONTENTS.

LIST of Books referred to	Page xv
Table of Sovereigns and Bishops	xix

BOOK I.

FROM THE PERSECUTION OF THE CHURCH BY NERO TO CONSTANTINE'S EDICT OF TOLERATION, A.D. 64-313.

CHAPTER I.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE.

	Page		Page
PREPARATION for the Gospel	1	Persecution under Domitian	5
Labours of the Apostles	2	Old age of St. John	6
Persecution under Nero	4	Early Christian writings	<i>ib.</i>
Destruction of Jerusalem	<i>ib.</i>	Church-government	7

CHAPTER II.

THE REIGNS OF TRAJAN AND HADRIAN, A.D. 98-138.

Calumnies against the Christians	10	Hadrian, emperor	19
State of the law	11	Apologies of Quadratus and Aris- tides	<i>ib.</i>
Trajan	<i>ib.</i>	Revolt of Barcochab	20
Martyrdom of Symeon	<i>ib.</i>	Change in the Church of Jerusalem	21
Correspondence of Pliny and Trajan	12		
Ignatius	14		

CHAPTER III.

THE REIGNS OF THE ANTONINES, A.D. 138-180.

Christianity under Antoninus Pius	22	Paschal controversy	29
Justin Martyr	<i>ib.</i>	Martyrdom of Polycarp	30
Reign of Marcus Aurelius	25	Martyrs of Lyons and Vienne	32
The Thundering Legion	28	Controversy with heathens—Celsus	33
Martyrdom of Justin	29	Athenagoras, Tatian, Bardesanes	34
Polycarp	<i>ib.</i>		

CHAPTER IV.

THE EARLY HERETICS.

False teaching in the Apostolic age	35	IV. Saturninus	48
Gnosticism	37	V. Basilides	49
I. Simon Magus	40	VI. Valentinus	52
II. Cerinthus	43	VII. Marcion	58
III. Ebionism	45	Providential use of Gnosticism	63

CHAPTER V.

THE REIGNS FROM COMMODUS TO ELAGABALUS, A.D. 180-222.

	Page		Page
State of the Christians	64	Artemon	83
Martyrdom of Apollonius	<i>ib.</i>	Praxeas	84
Persecution under Severus	65	Noëtus—Sabellius	85
Perpetua and her companions	66	The Philosophumena	<i>ib.</i>
Caracalla—Elagabalus	70	Catechetical school of Alexandria	87
Paschal controversy renewed	<i>ib.</i>	Pantænus	<i>ib.</i>
Irenæus	71	Clement of Alexandria	88
New character of heresies	72	Allegorical interpretation of Scrip- ture	89
Montanus	<i>ib.</i>	Disciplina Arcani	91
Tertullian	77	Neoplatonism	<i>ib.</i>
Development of doctrine	81		
Theodotus	83		

CHAPTER VI.

FROM ALEXANDER SEVERUS TO VALERIAN, A.D. 222-260.

Alexander Severus	94	II. Dionysius of Alexandria	112
Maximin the Thracian	95	Sabellianism	113
Philip the Arabian	<i>ib.</i>	Millennarianism	<i>ib.</i>
Decius—persecution	96	III. Cyprian	115
Gallus	97	Question of the lapsed	116
Valerian—persecution	<i>ib.</i>	Novatus	117
Eminent men—I. Origen	98	Novatian	118
The Hexapla	102	Plague at Carthage	121
Ordination of Origen	103	Controversy on Re-baptism	122
Origen at Cæsarea	104	Martyrdom of Cyprian	125
Opinions of Origen	106	Writings and opinions of Cyprian	127

CHAPTER VII.

FROM THE ACCESSION OF GALLIENUS TO THE EDICT OF TOLERATION
BY CONSTANTINE, A.D. 261-313.

Christianity legalised by Gallienus	130	Prosperity of the Church	142
Paul of Samosata	<i>ib.</i>	Diocletian	143
Aurelian	132	The last persecution	144
Manes	133	Eminent Martyrs	150
Manichæism	135	Edicts of Constantine	151

CHAPTER VIII.

SUPPLEMENTARY.

I. PROGRESS OF THE GOSPEL	152	Apostolical Churches	159
(1.) Extension of the Church	<i>ib.</i>	See of Rome	160
Christianity in Gaul	154	(3.) Chorepiscopi	<i>ib.</i>
British Church	<i>ib.</i>	(4.) Maintenance of the clergy	161
(2.) Social position of Christians	155	III. RITES AND USAGES	162
Number of the Christians	156	(1.) Churches	<i>ib.</i>
II. THE HIERARCHY	<i>ib.</i>	(2.) Baptism	<i>ib.</i>
(1.) Deaconesses	157	Baptism of infants	164
Deacons	<i>ib.</i>	(3.) Confirmation	165
Minor orders	<i>ib.</i>	(4.) Christian worship	166
(2.) Bishops	158	(5.) The Eucharist	<i>ib.</i>
Synods	159	The Agape	<i>ib.</i>
Metropolitans	159	(6.) Holy Days and Seasons	168

CHAPTER VIII.—*continued.*

	Page		Page
The Lord's Day	169	Charity	173
Fasts	<i>ib.</i>	Forbidden occupations and amuse- ments	175
Yearly Festivals	<i>ib.</i>	Ascetics	176
Festivals of Martyrs	170	Hermits	<i>ib.</i>
(7.) Penance	171	Celibacy	177
(8.) Christian art	172	Celibacy of the Clergy	<i>ib.</i>
IV. MORAL CHARACTER OF CHRIS- TIAN	173	History corrective of Idealism ..	178

BOOK II.

FROM CONSTANTINE TO GREGORY THE GREAT, A.D. 313-590.

CHAPTER I.

CONSTANTINE—DONATISM—ARIANISM, A.D. 313-337.

I. Constantine	179	Temporary suppression of the schism	196
Vision of the Cross	180	III. Arianism	197
Legislation of Constantine	181	The school of Antioch	<i>ib.</i>
Constantine sole emperor	184	Arius	198
He openly professes Christianity ..	185	He publishes his heresy and is ex- communicated	199
Foundation of Constantinople ..	186	The <i>Thalia</i>	<i>ib.</i>
Religion of Constantine	<i>ib.</i>	Interference of Constantine	200
Helena's visit to the Holy Land ..	187	The first General Council sum- moned	201
II. Donatism	188	The subject in dispute	<i>ib.</i>
Character of African Christianity ..	<i>ib.</i>	Council of Nicæa	203
Mensurius, bishop of Carthage ..	189	Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria ..	207
Council of Cirta	<i>ib.</i>	Arianism at Court	208
Cæcilian, bishop of Carthage ..	190	Arius recalled	<i>ib.</i>
A schism against him	191	Movement against Athanasius ..	209
The Schismatics appeal to Constan- tine	<i>ib.</i>	Council of Tyre	<i>ib.</i>
Council of Arles	192	Athanasius banished to Treves ..	211
Donatus	193	Death of Arius	212
Policy of Constantine	194	Baptism and death of Constantine ..	213
The Circumcellions	195		

CHAPTER II.

THE SONS OF CONSTANTINE, A.D. 337-361.

The sons of Constantine	214	George of Cappadocia intruded ..	226
Constantius	<i>ib.</i>	Submission of Hosius and Liberius ..	<i>ib.</i>
Athanasius restored	215	Divisions among the Arians	227
Council of Antioch	216	(1.) The Semiarians	<i>ib.</i>
Second exile of Athanasius	217	(2.) The Anomæans	228
Creeds of Antioch	<i>ib.</i>	(3.) The Acacians	229
Tumults at Constantinople	218	Council of Ancyra	230
Council of Sardica	219	Council of Rimini	<i>ib.</i>
Second restoration of Athanasius ..	220	Council of Seleucia	231
Renewed intrigues of the Arians ..	221	Macedonius deposed	232
Battle of Mursa	222	Meletius, bishop of Antioch	233
Councils of Arles and Milan	223	Multitude of Arian creeds	<i>ib.</i>
Banishment of Liberius and Hosius ..	224	Baptism and death of Constan- tius	234
Athanasius expelled from Alex- andria	225		

CHAPTER III.

JULIAN, A.D. 361-363.

	Page		Page
I. Julian	235	Death of Julian	244
He becomes emperor	236	II. Internal History of the Church	245
Paganism under Constantius	237	Recall of exiles	<i>ib.</i>
Apostacy of Julian	238	Athanasius resumes his see	<i>ib.</i>
He attempts to revive Paganism	239	Council of Alexandria	246
Measures against the Christians ..	240	Question as to <i>hypostasis</i>	<i>ib.</i>
Prohibition of teaching Heathen literature	242	Lucifer ordains Paulinus for Antioch	247
Attempt to adopt Christian usages into Paganism	243	Luciferian schism	<i>ib.</i>
Attempt to rebuild the Temple of Jerusalem	<i>ib.</i>	Fourth exile of Athanasius	248

CHAPTER IV.

FROM THE DEATH OF JULIAN TO THE END OF THE SECOND GENERAL COUNCIL, A.D. 363-381.

Jovian, emperor	249	Macedonianism	254
Valentinian and Valens	250	Progress of Orthodoxy	255
Council of Lampsacus	251	Basil of Cæsarea; Gregory of Nazianzum	256
Reconciliation of Semiarians with the orthodox	252	Edicts of Theodosius	260
Deaths of bishops	<i>ib.</i>	Gregory at Constantinople	<i>ib.</i>
Cruelties of Valens	253	The Second General Council	262
Death of Athanasius	<i>ib.</i>	Apollinarianism	265
Gratian, Valentinian II., and Theodosius, emperors	254		

CHAPTER V.

FROM THE END OF THE SECOND GENERAL COUNCIL TO THE DEATH OF THEODOSIUS, A.D. 381-395.

I. Ambrose archbishop of Milan ..	267	Deaths of Theodosius and Ambrose	275
Contest between Ambrose and Justina	268	II. State of Paganism	<i>ib.</i>
Influence of Ambrose with Theodosius	271	Destruction of the Serapeum	277
Affair of Callinicum	272	Paganism in the West	278
Massacre of Thessalonica—Penance of Theodosius	273	The altar of Victory	279
Murder of Valentinian II.	274	Laws of Theodosius	281
		III. Measures against heresy	283
		Priscillian	284

CHAPTER VI.

SUPPLEMENTARY.

I. PROGRESS OF THE GOSPEL	289	II. RELATIONS OF CHURCH AND STATE	294
(1.) Abyssinia	<i>ib.</i>	(1.) Position of the emperor	<i>ib.</i>
(2.) Iberia	290	(2.) Ecclesiastical Judicature	297
(3.) Persia	291	(3.) Influence of Christianity on law	296
(4.) The Goths—Ulphilas	<i>ib.</i>	Privilege of Intercession.	297
(5.) The Saracens	293		

CHAPTER VI.—*continued.*

	Page		Page
Right of asylum	297	Paula and Eustochium	329
III. THE HIERARCHY	<i>ib.</i>	Good and evil of Monasticism	330
(1.) Copiatæ—Parabolani	<i>ib.</i>	Monastic extravagances	337
(2.) Deacons—Archdeacons .. Arch-		Symeon the Stylite	338
presbyters	300	Daniel	339
(3.) Chorepiscopi—Periodontæ	301	V. RITES AND USAGES	341
(4.) Patriarchs—Exarchs	<i>ib.</i>	(1.) Evil influences of the age	<i>ib.</i>
(5.) The chief sees	302	(2.) Churches	344
(6.) See of Rome	303	(3.) Art	345
(7.) Position and privileges of the		(4.) The Liturgy	347
Clergy	306	(5.) Baptism	<i>ib.</i>
(8.) Appointment to sees	309	(6.) The Eucharist	348
Ordination	310	(7.) The Agape	<i>ib.</i>
(9.) Celibacy	311	(8.) The Lord's Day	349
IV. MONASTICISM	313	(9.) Festivals and Fasts	<i>ib.</i>
Antony	<i>ib.</i>	(10.) Penance	351
Pachomius	316	(11.) Reverence for saints	352
The monks of Nitria and Scetis	318	Relics	353
Progress of Monasticism	319	The Blessed Virgin	354
Variety of Rules	320	(12.) Pilgrimages	355
Jerome	321	VI. OPPOSITION TO THE TENDENCIES	
His residence in the Desert	<i>ib.</i>	OF THE AGE	357
He removes to Rome	323	Aërius	<i>ib.</i>
His female pupils	<i>ib.</i>	Jovinian	358
His letter to Demetrias	324	Vigilantius	360
Paula and her family	325	Apology for writers of Church his-	
Jerome and Paula leave Rome	327	tory	363
Jerome at Bethlehem	<i>ib.</i>	Note on Miracles	364
His version of the Bible	328		

CHAPTER VII.

ARCADIUS AND HONORIUS—ORIGENISTIC CONTROVERSY—ST. JOHN
CHRYSOSTOM.

I. Arcadius and Honorius	367	Fall of Eutropius	383
Paganism	368	Chrysostom's visit to Ephesus	384
Abolition of Gladiatorial shows	371	Intrigues of Severian and others	<i>ib.</i>
II. Origenistic Controversy	372	Theophilus of Alexandria	<i>ib.</i>
Jerome and Rufinus	373	Persecution of the "Long Bro-	
Epiphanius in Palestine	<i>ib.</i>	thers"	385
Cessation and renewal of the con-		They take refuge at Constantinople	386
troversy	375	Epiphanius at Constantinople	387
Death of Rufinus	377	Synod of the Oak	388
III. John Chrysostom	378	Banishment and recall of Chry-	
Chrysostom bishop of Constanti-		sostom	389
nople	379	Second exile of Chrysostom	391
The Schism of Antioch healed	381	Death of Chrysostom	393
Chrysostom attempts reforms, and		Reconciliation of the Joannites	<i>ib.</i>
makes enemies	<i>ib.</i>		

CHAPTER VIII.

ST. AUGUSTINE—DONATISM—PELAGIANISM.

I. Augustine—Early years	395	His labours and writings	400
His conversion	398	II. Donatism from A.D. 348	401
He becomes presbyter and bishop	399	Internal disagreements	<i>ib.</i>

CHAPTER VIII.—*continued.*

	Page		Page
Optatus—Tichonius	402	Synod at Jerusalem	414
Augustin mixes in the contro-		— of Diospolis	415
versy	403	Proceedings in Africa and at Rome	416
Outrages of Donatists, and laws		Julian of Eclanum	418
against them	404	General condemnation of Pela-	
Conference of Carthage	405	gianism	419
Further laws against the Dona-		Doctrines of Augustine and Pelagius	421
tists	408	Augustine on Predestination and	
Decline of the sect	409	Election	425
III. Pelagianism	410	Semipelagianism	427
Pelagius and Cœlestius	411	IV. Last years and death of Au-	
Cœlestius condemned in Africa ..	412	gustine	430
Letter of Pelagius to Demetrias ..	414		

CHAPTER IX.

NESTORIANISM.

Theodosius the younger	432	A general Council summoned ..	444
War with Persia	433	Council of Ephesus	445
Pulcheria—Marcian	434	Rival Council of the Orientals ..	448
Attila	<i>ib.</i>	Dalmatius with the emperor ..	449
Death of Valentinian III.	435	Continuation of the Council ..	450
Nestorius bishop of Constantinople	<i>ib.</i>	Conference at Chalcedon	<i>ib.</i>
Doctrine of the Incarnation	436	Question as to Nestorius	451
Outbreak of the Nestorian contro-		Distractions of the Church	452
versy	438	Reconciliation of John with Cyril	453
Cyril of Alexandria	440	Distractions continued	<i>ib.</i>
Breach between Cyril and Nes-		Suppression of Nestorianism ..	454
torius	441	Fate of Nestorius	455
Correspondence with Cœlestine ..	<i>ib.</i>	Attempt to censure Theodore and	
Anathemas and counter-anathemas	443	Diodore	456
Theodoret	<i>ib.</i>	Nestorianism in the East	457

CHAPTER X.

EUTYCHIANISM—THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON—ADVANCE OF THE
ROMAN SEE.

I. Eutyches	458	Jerusalem erected into a Patri-	
Differences between Egyptians and		archate	474
Syrians	<i>ib.</i>	Jurisdiction assigned to Constan-	
Dioscorus bishop of Alexandria ..	459	tinople	475
Eutyches accused of heresy	460	Correspondence of Leo with Mar-	
He is condemned at Constantinople	461	cian and Anatolius	476
Negotiations—a Council summoned	462	II. Growing power of Patriarchs	477
Council at Ephesus (<i>Latrocinium</i>)	463	Advance of the Roman See	<i>ib.</i>
Further negotiations	466	Innocent—Zosimus—Cœlestine ..	479
Marcian summons a General Coun-		Leo	480
cil	467	Case of Hilary of Arles	481
Council of Chalcedon	468	Effect of the Council of Chalcedon	483
Condemnation of Dioscorus	470	Leo and Anatolius	484
Discussions and Decree as to the		Interference of emperors in elec-	
Faith	471	tions of Roman bishops	<i>ib.</i>
Case of Theodoret	473		

CHAPTER XI.

FALL OF THE WESTERN EMPIRE—CONVERSION OF THE BARBARIANS—
VANDAL PERSECUTION IN AFRICA.

	Page		Page
I. The last Emperors of the West	486	(5.) South Germany—St. Severin	495
II. Paganism	487	(6.) The Franks—Clovis	496
III. (1.) Arianism of Barbarians ..	489	IV. The Vandals in Africa	498
(2.) Britain	490	Persecution of Catholics by Gen-	
Pelagianism	491	seric	499
Christianity extirpated by the		Huneric'	ib.
Saxons	492	Conference of Carthage	501
(3.) Scotland—St. Ninian	493	The Confessors of Typasa	502
(4.) Ireland—St. Patrick	ib.	Huneric's successors	503

CHAPTER XII.

MONOPHYSITISM—JUSTINIAN—THE "THREE ARTICLES."
A.D. 451-566.

I. Consequences of the Council of		Deaths of Boëthius and Symmachus	519
Chalcedon	505	III. Justinian emperor	520
Disturbances in Palestine	ib.	Conquests in Africa and Italy ..	ib.
Troubles at Alexandria	506	Character of Justinian	521
Leo emperor	ib.	The schools of Athens closed ..	522
Zeno emperor	507	Laws against Paganism and heresy	523
Usurpation of Basiliscus	ib.	Agapetus at Constantinople	ib.
Restoration of Zeno	508	Sylverius and Vigilius, bishops of	
The Henoticon	509	Rome	524
Breach between Rome and Constan-		Dissensions as to Origen	525
tinople	511	"Three Articles" controversy ..	526
Anastasius emperor	512	Vigilius at Constantinople	527
Justin emperor	516	The fifth General Council	529
Reconciliation between Constan-		Sequel of the Council	530
tinople and Rome	517	Heresy and death of Justinian ..	531
II. Reign of Theodoric in Italy ..	ib.	Monophysitism in Armenia	532
Mission of John bishop of Rome to		Jacob al Baradai	ib.
Constantinople	519	Dissensions in Egypt	ib.

CHAPTER XIII.

SEMIPELAGIANISM—MISSIONS—DECLINE OF ARIANISM IN THE WEST.

I. Semipelagianism	534	IV. The Lombards in Italy	540
Faustus of Riez	535	Arianism extinguished in Gaul and	
Condemnation of his opinions ..	536	Spain	541
II. Conversion of Barbarians ..	538	V: Britain—St. Columba	542
Nestorian missions	ib.	British rule as to Easter	544
III. Christianity of the Franks ..	539		

CHAPTER XIV.

SUPPLEMENTARY.

	Page		Page
I. THE PATRIARCHAL SEES—RELATIONS WITH THE STATE	545	III. MONASTICISM	558
The Eastern patriarchates	<i>ib.</i>	Benedict and his Order	559
Bishoprick of Rome	546	IV. RITES AND USAGES	565
Relations with the State	548	(1.) Reverence for saints	<i>ib.</i>
Policy of Justinian	549	(2.) The Blessed Virgin	567
II. CONDITION OF THE CLERGY ..	551	(3.) Images and pictures	<i>ib.</i>
(1.) Celibacy	<i>ib.</i>	(4.) Festivals and Fasts	568
(2.) Privileges and duties	552	(5.) The Sacraments	569
(3.) Church patronage	554	(6.) Penance	570
(4.) The clergy of the Western kingdoms	555	V. DECLINE OF LEARNING	571
INDEX			
			573

LIST OF BOOKS REFERRED TO.

[*Books which are not in this List will generally be found described in the places where they are quoted.*]

- AGATHIAS, ed. Niebuhr (in the Bonn edition of the Byzantine Historians).
 Alexander, Natalis, Hist. Ecclesiastica, Bingen, 1788.
 Ammianus Marcellinus, in Hist. Romanæ Scriptores Latini, Heidelb. 1743.
 Ampère, Littérature Française au Moyen Age, Paris, 1841.
 Anastasius, Vitæ Pontificum Romanorum, in Muratori, t. iii.
 Athanasius, ed. Montfaucon, Paris, 1698.
 ——— Treatises against Arianism, and Historical Tracts, ed. Newman, Oxford, 1842-4.
 Augustanæ Historiæ Scriptores, in Hist. Rom. Scriptores, Heidelb. 1743.
 Augusti, Denkwürdigkeiten aus der christlichen Archäologie, Leipz. 1817, seqq.
 Bähr, Gesch. der Christlich-römischen Litteratur, Carlsr. 1840.
 Baronius, Annales Ecclesiastici, cum Pagii Critica, ed. Mansi, Lucca, 1738, seqq.
 [Baronius is cited by years and paragraphs; Pagi, by the volume and page.]
 Barrow on the Pope's Supremacy, in Works, vol. i. Lond. 1700.
 Basilius, ed. Benedictina, Paris, 1721.
 Bayle, Dictionnaire, Paris, 1820.
 Beausobre, Hist. du Manichéisme, Amsterd. 1734.
 Beda, Hist. Eccles. Gentis Anglorum, ed. Hussey, Oxf. 1846.
 Beugnot, Hist. de la Destruction du Paganisme en Occident, Paris, 1835.
 Bibliotheca Patrum, Lyons, 1677.
 Bingham, Lond. 1726.
 Blunt, History of the Church in the First Three Centuries, Lond. 1856. [This is the work intended when the author's name only is given.]
 ———, on the Right Use of the Early Fathers, Lond. 1858.
 Broglie (A. de), L'Eglise et l'Empire au 4^{me} Siècle, tt. i.-ii. Paris, 1856.
 Bull, ed. Burton, Oxf. 1827.
 Bunsen, Christianity and Mankind (including 'Hippolytus and his Age,' and 'Analecta Antenicæna'), ed. 2, Lond. 1854.
 Burton, Lectures on Church-History, Oxf. 1831-3.
 Canisius, Lectiones Antiquæ, ed. Basnage, Amsterd. 1725.
 Cave, Hist. Litteraria, Lond. 1688.
 Cedrenus (in the Paris edition of the Byzantine Historians).
 Chronicon Paschale (in the Bonn edition of the Byzantine Historians).
 Chrysostomus, ed. Montfaucon, Paris, 1718.
 ——— Homiliæ, ed. Field, Cambr. 1839, seqq.
 Clemens Alexandrinus, ed. Potter, Oxf. 1715.
 Clinton, Fasti Romani, Oxf. 1845.
 Codex Justinianus (in Corpus Jur. Civ.).
 ——— Theodosianus, ed. Gothofred. Lyons, 1665.
 Collier, Eccl. Hist. of Britain, Lond. 1840-1.
 Concilia, see Hardouin, Labbe. [Canons of Councils are usually cited by the date of the Council and the number of the canon.]
 Corpus Juris Civilis, Amst. 1663.
 Cyprianus, ed. Fell. Oxf. 1683. [The edition by Migne, Patrol. iii.-iv. has been generally used.]
 Cyrillus Alexandrinus, Paris, 1638.
 ——— adv. Julianum, see Julian.
 Döllinger, Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte, Ratisbon, 1843.
 Dorner, Lehre v. d. Person Christi, ed. 2, Stuttgart, 1845, seqq.
 Ducange, Glossarium Mediæ et Infimæ Latinitatis, ed. Henschel, Paris, 1840-6.
 Dupin, Nouvelle Bibliothèque des Auteurs Ecclésiastiques, Paris, 1681, seqq.
 Ecclesiasticæ Historiæ Scriptores Græci, ed. Reading, Cambr. 1720.

- Ellendorf, *Der Primat der römischen Päpste*, Darmst. 1841-6.
 Epiphanius, ed. Petavius, Paris, 1622.
 Eusebius, *Hist. Ecclesiastica and Vita Constantini*, ed. Heinichen, Leipz. 1827-30.
 [Where the name of the work is not given, the *History* is meant, except in Book II. chap. 1, where such references indicate the *Life of Constantine*.]
 Evagrius, *see* Eccl. Hist. Scriptores.
 Evans (R. W.), *Biography of the Early Church*, Lond. 1837-9.
 Fergusson, *Handbook of Architecture*, Lond. 1855.
 Field, *Of the Church*, ed. Eden and Taylor, Lond. 1847-52.
 Finlay, *History of Greece under the Romans; the Greek and Byzantine Empires, &c.*, Edinb. 1844; seqq.
 Fleury, *Hist. Ecclésiastique*, Paris, 1844. [This is cited by books and paragraphs.]
 ————— A.D. 381-456, translation, ed. Newman, Oxf. 1842-3.
 Gfrörer, *Kirchengeschichte* (to A.D. 1046), Stuttg. 1841-6.
 Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. Milman, Lond. 1846.
 Giesel, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, vol. i. Bonn, 1844-5; vol. vi. (*Dogmengeschichte*), 1855.
 Gregorius Nazianzenus, ed. Benedict. Paris, 1789-1842.
 ————— Turonensis, ed. Teulet, Paris, 1836.
 Guéranger, *Institutions Liturgiques*, i.-ii. Paris, 1840-1.
 Guericke, *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, Berlin, 1849-50.
 Guizot, *Lectures on the Hist. of Civilisation*, transl. by Hazlitt, Lond. 1846.
 Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, transl. by Buch, Edinb. 1846-7.
 Hallam, *Europe during the Middle Ages*, Lond. 1841; *Supplemental Notes*, 1848.
 ————— *Literature of Europe*, Lond. 1837-9.
 Hardouin, *Concilia*, Paris, 1714, seqq.
 Hase, *Kirchengeschichte*, Leipz. 1854.
Histoire Littéraire de la France, par les Bénédictins de S. Maur, Paris, 1733, seqq.
 Hope's *Hist. of Architecture*, Lond. 1839.
 Hussey's *Lectures on the Rise of the Papal Power*, Oxf. 1851.
 Inett, *Origines Anglicanæ*, Oxf. 1710.
 Irenæus, ed. Stieren, Leipz. 1853.
 Jaffé, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, Berlin, 1851.
 Joannes Damascenus, ed. Le Quien, Paris, 1712.
 Julianus, ed. Spanheim, Leipz. 1696.
 Justinus Martyr. ed. Otto, Jena, 1847-50.
 Kaye (Bp. of Lincoln), *on Clement of Alexandria*, Lond. 1835.
 ————— Justin Martyr, Camb. 1829.
 ————— Tertullian, Lond. 1845.
 ————— the Council of Nicæa and St. Athanasius, Lond. 1853.
 Kemble, *The Saxons in England*, Lond. 1849.
 King, *Primer of the Hist. of the Church in Ireland*, vol. i. Dubl. 1858; vols. ii.-iii. 1846-51.
 Labbe et Cossart, *Concilia*, Paris, 1671.
 Lanigan, *Ecclesiastical Hist. of Ireland*, Dubl. 1822.
 Lappenberg, *Gesch. von England*, Hamb. 1834-7.
 ————— vol. i. transl. by Thorpe, 2 vols. Lond. 1846.
 Lembke, *Gesch. von Spanien*, Hamb. 1831, seqq.
 Lindsay (Lord), *Sketches of the Hist. of Christian Art*, Lond. 1847.
 Lingard, *History of England*, ed. 5, Lond. 1849.
 ————— *The Anglo-Saxon Church*, ed. 2, Lond. 1845.
 Löbell, Gregor von Tours, Leipz. 1839.
 Mabillon, *Acta Sanctorum Ordinis S. Benedicti*, Paris, 1668-1701.
 Marca (de), *De Concordantia Sacerdotii et Imperii*, Paris, 1663.
 Mariana, *Historia general de España*, Madr. 1817, seqq.
 Martene, *De Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus*, Venet. 1783.
 Martin, H., *Hist. de France*, Paris, 1850, sqq.
 Martineau, A., *Church History in England*, Lond. 1853.
 Matter, *Hist. du Gnosticisme*, Paris, 1843.
 ————— *Hist. du Christianisme*, Paris, 1839.
 Michelet, *Hist. de France*, Brussels, 1841.
 Migne (*see* *Patrologia*).

- Milman, *Hist. of Christianity to the Abolition of Paganism*, Lond. 1840. [Where the author's name only is given in the present volume, this is the work intended.]
- *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, Lond. 1854-6. [In vol. ii. this is cited by the author's name only.]
- Möhler, *Athanasius der Grosse*, Mentz, 1827.
- Monumenta Historica Britannica*, edd. Petrie and Hardy, Lond. 1848.
- Mosheim, *De Rebus Christianorum ante Constantinum Commentarii*, Helmst. 1753.
- *Institutiones Majores*, Helmst. 1739.
- *Eccel. History*, translated by Murdock, edited by Soames, Lond. 1841.
- [Where the page only is given, the reference is to the *Commentaries*; where a volume is specified, to the *History*.]
- Mozley, *The Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination*, Lond. 1855.
- Münter, *Primordia Eccles. Africanæ*, Copenhagen, 1829.
- Muratori, *Italicarum Rerum Scriptores*, Milan, 1723, seqq.
- *Annali d' Italia*, Monaco, 1761-4.
- Neander, *Church History*, translated by Torrey, Lond. 1850-2.
- *Memorials of Christian Life*, translated by Ryland, Lond. 1852.
- *Pfanzung u. Leitung d. Christl. Kirche durch die Apostel*, Hamb. 1847-8.
- *Antignostikus, Geist des Tertullianus*, Berl. 1849.
- *Der heil. Joh. Chrysostomus*, Berl. 1848.
- Niebuhr, *Vorträge über römische Geschichte*, ed. Isler, Berl. 1848.
- transl. by Schmitz, Lond. 1844.
- Optatus, ed. Du Pin, Paris, 1702.
- Origenes, ed. De la Rue, Paris, 1733.
- Ozanam, *La Civilisation Chrétienne au 5^{me} Siècle*, Paris, 1856. [In vol. i. this is intended when the author's name only is given.]
- *La Civil. Chrét. chez les Francs*, Paris, 1849.
- Pagi, *see* Baronius.
- Palgrave, *Hist. of the Anglo-Saxons*, Lond. 1831.
- Palmer, *Origines Liturgicæ*, Oxf. 1836.
- Patres Apostolici, ed. Jacobson, Oxf. 1838.
- Patrologia Ecclesiæ Latinæ, ed. Migne, Paris, 1844-55. [This collection, which reaches from Tertullian to Innocent III., and consists for the most part of reprints from the best earlier editions, has been used for the Latin writers, except where other editions are named.]
- Perry's *History of the Franks*, Lond. 1857.
- Petavius, *De Trinitate and De Incarnatione*, in *Dogmata Theologica*, Paris, 1644.
- Philostorgius, *see* *Eccel. Hist. Scriptores*.
- Photius, *Myriobiblon seu Bibliotheca*, Rouen, 1653.
- Pitra, *Spicilegium Solesmense*, Paris, 1855.
- Planck, *Gesch. der Christlichen Gesellschaftsverfassung*, Hanov. 1805-9.
- Procopius (in the Paris edition of the *Byzantine Historians*).
- Pusey, *The Councils of the Church*, Oxf. 1857.
- Retberg, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* (to A.D. 814), Götting. 1846-8.
- Revillout, *L'Arianisme des Peuples Germaniques*, Paris, 1850.
- Ritter, *Geschichte der Philosophie*, Hamb. 1836, seqq.
- Rohrbacher, *Hist. Universelle de l'Eglise Catholique*, Paris, 1850-2.
- Routh, *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, Oxf. 1846-8.
- *Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Opuscula*, Oxf. 1840.
- Rückert, *Culturgesch. des deutschen Volkes in der Zeit des Ueberganges aus d. Heidenthum in d. Christenthum*, Leipz. 1853-4.
- Russell (Bp. of Glasgow), *Hist. of the Church in Scotland*, Lond. 1834.
- Schaff, *Gesch. der apostolischen Kirche* (vol. i. of an intended *Church History*), Leipz. 1854.
- Schröckh, *Christliche Kirchengeschichte* (vols. i.-xiv. ed. 2, Leipz. 1772-1825; the rest, ed. i., 1790, seqq.).
- Sismondi, *Hist. des Français*, Paris, 1821.
- *Hist. des Républiques Italiennes*, Brussels, 1826.
- Skinner, *Ecclesiastical Hist. of Scotland*, Lond. 1788.
- Socrates, } *see* *Eccel. Hist. Scriptores*.
- Sozomenus, }
- Spottiswoode, *Hist. of the Church in Scotland*, ed. Russell, Edinb. 1849-51.
- Tertullian, translation, ed. Pusey, vol. i. Oxf. 1842.

- Theiner, Die Einführung der erzwungenen Ehelosigkeit bei den Christl. Geistlichen, Altenb. 1845.
 Theodoretus, ed. Sirmond, Paris, 1642.
 ———— Hist. Ecclesiastica, *see* Eccl. Hist. Scriptores.
 Theodorus Lector, *see* Eccl. Hist. Scriptores.
 Theophanes (in the Bonn ed. of Byzantine Historians).
 Thierry, Amédée, Hist. d'Attila et de ses Successeurs, Paris, 1857.
 Thiersch, Church History, vol. i. transl. by Carlyle, Lond. 1852.
 Thomassin, Vetus et Nova Ecclesiæ Disciplina, Naples, 1770, seqq.
 Tillemont, Hist. des Empereurs, Paris, 1690-1738.
 ———— Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire Ecclésiastique, Paris, 1701-12. [Vols. i.-vii. and ix. are of the second edition.]
 Turner's Hist. of the Anglo-Saxons, Lond. 1836.
 Villemain, Tableau de l'Eloquence Chrétienne au 4^{me} Siècle, Paris, 1850.
 Walch, Histoire der Ketzereien, Leipz. 1762-83.
 Wall, Hist. of Infant Baptism, ed. Cotton, Oxf. 1836.
 Walter, Lehrbuch des Kirchenrechts, Bonn, 1842.
 Waterland, ed. Van Mildert, Oxf. 1843.
 Wiggers, Augustinismus und Pelagianismus, Hamb. 1821-33.
 Wiltch, * Kirchliche Geographie u. Statistik, Berl. 1836.
 Zosimus (in the Bonn edition of the Byzantine Historians).

* This writer's "Atlas Sacer sive Ecclesiasticus," Gotha, 1843 (containing five large and many smaller maps) will be found very useful in the study of Church history.

LIST OF SOVEREIGNS AND BISHOPS.

BISHOPS OF ROME. (From Jaffé's *Regesta*.)

(The Names in brackets are those of *Anti-popes*.)

A.D.		A.D.		A.D.		A.D.
	St. Peter	67		422.	Cœlestine I.	432
67.	Linus	79		432.	Sixtus III.	440
79.	Cletus or Anacletus	91		440.	Leo I.	461
91.	Clement	100		461.	Hilary	468
100.	Evaristus	109		468.	Simplicius	483
109.	Alexander I.	119		483.	Felix III.	492
119.	Xystus or Sixtus I.	128		492.	Gelasius I.	496
128.	Telesphorus	139		496.	Anastasius II.	498
139.	Hyginus	142		498.	Symmachus	514
142.	Pius I.	157		[Laurence, 498—505.]		
157.	Anicetus	168		514.	Hormisdas	523
168.	Soter	176		523.	John I.	526
177.	Eleutherius	190		526.	Felix IV.	530
190.	Victor I.	202		530.	Boniface II.	532
[Thus far the dates are more or less conjectural.]			[Dioscorus, Sept. 17—Oct. 14, 530.]			
202.	Zephyrinus	218		532.	John II.	535
218.	Callistus or Calixtus I.	223		535.	Agapetus I.	536
223.	Urban I.	230		536.	Sylvester	537
230.	Pontian	235		537.	Vigilius	555
235.	Anterus	236		555.	Pelagius I.	560
236.	Fabian	250		560.	John III.	573
251.	Cornelius	252		574.	Benedict I.	578
[Novatian 251.]				578.	Pelagius II.	590
252.	Lucius I.	253		590.	Gregory I.	604
253.	Stephen I.	257		604.	Sabinian	606
257.	Sixtus or Xystus II.	258		607.	Boniface III. (Feb. 19—Nov. 12)	
259.	Dionysius	269		608.	Boniface IV.	615
269.	Felix I.	274		615.	Deusedit	618
275.	Eutychian	283		619.	Boniface V.	625
283.	Caius	296		625.	Honorius I.	638
296.	Marcellinus	304		638.	Severinus	640
[A vacancy of four years.]				640.	John IV.	642
308.	Marcellus	310		642.	Theodore I.	649
310.	Eusebius (Apr. 18—Sept. 26)			649.	Martin I.	653
311.	Melchiades	314		654.	Eugenius I.	657
314.	Sylvester I.	335		657.	Vitalian	672
336.	Mark (Jan. 18—Oct. 7)			672.	Adeodatus	676
337.	Julius I.	352		676.	Donus	678
352.	Liberius	366		678.	Agatho	681
[Felix II. 355-8.]				682.	Leo II.	683
[Ursinus, 366-7.]				683.	Benedict II.	685
366.	Damasus	384		685.	John V.	686
384.	Siricius	398		686.	Conon	687
398.	Anastasius I.	401		[Paschal, 687-692.]		
402.	Innocent I.	417		[Theodore, Sept.—Dec. 687.]		
417.	Zosimus	418		687.	Sergius I.	701
[Eulalius, 418-9.]				701.	John VI.	705
418.	Boniface I.	422		705.	John VII.	707
				708.	Sisinnius (Jan. —Feb. 7)	

A.D.		A.D.
708.	Constantine I.	715
715.	Gregory II.	731
731.	Gregory III.	741
741.	Zacharias	752
752.	Stephen (died without conse- cration)*	
—	Stephen II.	757
757.	Paul I.	767
	[Constantine II. 767-8.]	
	[Philip, 768.]	
768.	Stephen III.	772
772.	Adrian I.	795
795.	Leo III.	816
816.	Stephen IV.	817
817.	Paschal I.	824
824.	Eugenius II.	827
827.	Valentine (died within a month —dates uncertain)	
—	Gregory IV.	844
	[John—Jan. 844.]	
844.	Sergius II.	847
847.	Leo IV.	855
855.	Benedict III.	858
	[Anastasius, Aug.—Sept. 855.]	
858.	Nicolas I.	867
867.	Adrian II.	872
872.	John VIII.	882
882.	Marinus I.	884
884.	Adrian III.	885
885.	Stephen V.	891
891.	Formosus	896
896.	Boniface VI. (May—June)	
—	Stephen VI.	897
897.	Romanus (July—Nov.)	
—	Theodore II. (Nov.—Dec.)	
898.	John IX.	900
900.	Benedict IV.	903
903.	Leo V. (Aug.—Sept.)	
—	Christopher	904
904.	Sergius III.	911
911.	Anastasius III.	913
913.	Lando	914
914.	John X.	928
928.	Leo VI.	929
929.	Stephen VII.	931
931.	John XI.	936

A.D.		A.D.
936.	Leo VII.	939
939.	Stephen VIII.	942
942.	Marinus II.	946
946.	Agapetus II.	955
955.	John XII.	963
963.	Leo VIII.	965
	[Benedict V. May—June 964.]	
965.	John XIII.	972
972.	Benedict VI.	974
	[Boniface VII. July—Aug. 974.]	
974.	Benedict VII.	983
983.	John XIV.	984
	[Boniface VII. again, 984-5.]	
985.	John XV.	996
996.	Gregory V.	999
	[John XVI. 997-8.]*	
999.	Sylvester II.	1003
1003.	John XVI. (Jan. 13—Dec. 7)	
—	John XVII.	1009
1009.	Sergius IV.	1012
1012.	Benedict VIII.	1024
	[Gregory, Jan.—Dec. 1012.]	
1024.	John XVIII.	1033
1033.	Benedict IX.	1046
	[Sylvester III. 1044-6.]	
1045.	Gregory VI.	1046
1046.	Clement II.	1047
1047.	Damasus II.	1048
1048.	Leo IX.	1054
1054.	Victor II.	1057
1057.	Stephen IX.	1058
	[Benedict X. 1058-9.]	
1059.	Nicolas II.	1061
1061.	Alexander II.	1073
	[Honorius II. 1061-9.]	
1073.	Gregory VII.	1085
	[Clement III. 1080-1100.]	
1086.	Victor III.	1087
1088.	Urban II.	1099
1099.	Paschal II.	1118
	[Theoderic, 1100.]	
	[Albert, 1102.]	
	[Sylvester IV. 1105-1111.]	
1118.	Gelasius II.	1119
	[Gregory VIII. 1118-1121.]	
1119.	Calixtus II.	1124

EMPERORS.

14.	Tiberius	37
37.	Caligula	41
41.	Claudius	54
54.	Nero	68
68.	Galba	69
69.	Otho	69
69.	Vitellius	69
69.	Vespasian	79
79.	Titus	81
81.	Domitian	96
96.	Nerva	98
98.	Trajan	117

117.	Hadrian	138
138.	Antoninus	161
161.	M. Aurelius	180
180.	Commodus	192
193.	Pertinax	193
193.	Didius Julian	193
193.	Severus	211
211.	Caracalla	217
217.	Macrinus	218
218.	Elagabalus	222
222.	Alex. Severus	235
235.	Maximin	238

* These are reckoned by Jaffé in the series of popes of their respective names, but are more commonly omitted.

A.D.		A.D.		A.D.		A.D.	
238.	Gordian	244		305.	{ Constantius I.	306	
244.	Philip	249			{ Galerius	311	
249.	Decius	251		306.	{ Constantine I.	337	
251.	Gallus	253		307.	{ Licinius	324	
253.	{ Valerian	260		308.	{ Maximin	313	
	{ Gallienus	268			{ Constantine II.	340	
268.	Claudius	270		337.	{ Constantius II.	361	
270.	Aurelian	275			{ Constans.	350	
275.	Tacitus	276		361.	{ Julian	363	
276.	Probus	282		363.	{ Jovian	364	
282.	Carus	283		364.	{ Valentinian I.	375	
283.	{ Carinus	285			{ Valens	378	
	{ Numerian	284		367.	{ Gratian	383	
284.	{ Diocletian			375.	{ Valentinian II.	392	
285.	{ Maximian	305		379.	{ Theodosius I.	395	

EMPERORS OF THE WEST.

395.	Honorius	423		467.	Anthemius	472	
425.	Valentinian III.	455		472.	Olybrius	472	
455.	Maximus	455		472.	{ Glycerius	474	
455.	Avitus	456			{ Nepos	475	
457.	Majorian	461		475.	Augustulus	476	
461.	Severus (Ricimer)	467					

EMPERORS OF THE EAST.

395.	Arcadius	408		813.	Leo V. (the Armenian)	820	
408.	Theodosius II.	450		820.	Michael II. (the Stammerer)	829	
450.	Marcian	457		829.	Theophilus	842	
457.	Leo I.	474		842.	Michael III. (the Drunkard)	867	
474.	{ Leo II.	474		867.	Basil I. (the Macedonian)	886	
	{ Zeno	475		886.	Leo VI. (the Philosopher)	911	
475.	Basiliscus	477			{ Alexander	912	
477.	Zeno (restored)	491		911	{ Constantine VII. (Porphyro-		
491.	Anastasius	518			genitus—alone from 945)	959	
518.	Justin I.	527		to	{ Romanus I. (Lecapenus)	945	
527.	Justinian	565		959.	{ 919. (Christopher, Stephen,		
565.	Justin II.	578			{ Constantine VIII.)		
578.	Tiberius II.	582		959.	{ Romanus II.	963	
582.	Maurice	602		963.	Nicephorus Phocas	969	
602.	Phocas	610		969.	John Tzimiscees	976	
610.	Heraclius	641		976.	{ Basil II.	1025	
641.	{ Constantine III.	641			{ Constantine IX.	1028	
	{ Heracleonas	641		1028.	Romanus III. (Argyros)	1034	
641.	Constans II.	668		1034.	Michael IV. (the Paphla-		
668.	Constantine IV. (Pogonatus)	685			gonian)	1041	
685.	Justinian II.	695		1041.	Michael V. (Calaphates)	1042	
695.	Leontius	698		1042	{ Zoe.		
698.	Tiberius Apsimar	705			to { Constantine X. (Monomachus)	1054	
705.	Justinian II. (restored)	711		1056.	Theodora (alone from 1054)	1056	
711.	Philippicus	713		1056.	Michael VI. (Stratioticus)	1057	
713.	Anastasius II.	716		1057.	Isaac Comnenus	1059	
716.	Theodosius III.	717		1059.	Constantine XII. (Ducas)	1067	
717.	Leo III. (the Isaurian)	741		1067.	{ Eudocia		
741.	Constantine V. (Copronymus)	775			{ Romanus III. (Diogenes)	1071	
775.	Leo IV.	780			{ Michael VII. (Parapinaces)		
780.	{ Constantine VI.	797		1071.	{ Andronicus I.	1078	
	{ Irene	802			{ Constantine XII.		
802.	Nicephorus	811		1078.	Nicephorus III. (Botoniates)	1081	
811.	Stauracius	811		1081.	Alexius I. (Comnenus)	1118	
811.	Michael I. (Rhagabe)	813		1118.	John, or Calo-Johannes	1143	

EMPERORS OF THE WEST, FROM CHARLEMAGNE.

(The date in the first column is that of succession to the kingdom of Germany; that in the second, of the Imperial Coronation.)

A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.	A.D.
	800. Charlemagne	814	912	Conrad I.	920
814	813. Louis the Pious	840	920	Henry I. (the Fowler)	936
	817. Lothair	855			
	850. Louis II.	875	936	962. Otho I.	973
	875. Charles the Bald	877	973	967. Otho II.	983
	884. Charles the Fat	887	983	996. Otho III.	1002
887	896. Arnulph	899	1002	1014. Henry II.	1024
	891. Guy		1024	1027. Conrad II.	1039
	894. Lambert		1039	1046. Henry III.	1056
	901. Louis of Provence		1056	1084. Henry IV.	1106
	916. Berengar		1106	1111. Henry V.	1125

KINGS OF FRANCE FROM THE ACCESSION OF THE CAROLINGIAN DYNASTY.

752. Pipin	768	898. Charles III. (the Simple) ..	923
768. { Charlemagne	814	923. Rodolf	936
{ Carloman	772	936. Louis IV. (d'Ostremer) ..	954
814. Louis the Pious	840	954. Lothair	986
840. Charles II. (the Bald) ..	877	986. Louis V. (le Fainéant) ..	987
877. Louis II. (the Stammerer) ..	879	987. Hugh Capet	996
879. { Louis III.	882	996. Robert I.	1031
{ Carloman	884	1031. Henry I.	1060
884. Charles the Fat	888	1060. Philip I.	1108
888. Odo, or Eudes	898	1108. Louis VI. (the Fat)	1137

KINGS OF ENGLAND.

800. Egbert	836	975. Edward the Martyr	978
836. Ethelwulf	857	978. Ethelred II. (the Unready) ..	1016
857. { Ethelbald	860	1016. Edmund Ironside	1016
{ Ethelbert	866	1016. Canute	1035
866. Ethelred I.	871	1035. Harold (Harefoot)	1039
871. Alfred	901	1039. Hardicanute	1042
901. Edward the Elder	924	1042. Edward the Confessor ..	1066
924. Athelstan	941	1066. Harold	1066
941. Edmund	946	1066. William I. (the Conqueror) ..	1087
946. Edred	955	1087. William II. (Rufus)	1100
955. Edwy	959	1100. Henry I.	1135
959. Edgar	975		

As the First Volume of this work is sometimes referred to in the Second, the following table is given for the purpose of enabling the reader to accommodate such references to the present edition :—

VOL. II.		VOL. I.	VOL. II.		VOL. I.
Page 3, note ^o ,		read page 550.	221, note ⁿ ,		read page 356.
8	- q	- 546.	267	- t	- 547.
21	- r	- 542.		- y	- 304.
72	- s	- 495.	285	- k	- 569.
79	- d	- 3.	288	- s	- 537.
80	- h	- 346.	303	- x	- 463-6.
86	- m	- 346.	312	- o	- 121.
181	- q	- 297.		- p	- 406.
186	- q	- 322.	422	- p	- 286-7.
187	- s	- 553.	453	- t	- 278.
188	- c	- 554.	486	- q	- 316.
214	- s	- 165.	495	- f	- 154.
215	- m	- 349.			

The books of the Second Volume are now cited as if they were numbered continuously from the beginning; thus "Book III." means Book I. of Vol. II.

HISTORY

OF

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

BOOK I.

FROM THE PERSECUTION OF THE CHURCH BY NERO TO
CONSTANTINE'S EDICT OF TOLERATION, A.D. 64-313.

CHAPTER I.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE.

THE fulness of the time was come^a when Christianity was proclaimed on earth. The way had been prepared for it, not only by that long system of manifest and special training which God had bestowed on his chosen people, but by the labours of Gentile thought, employing the highest powers in the search after truth, yet unable to satisfy man's natural cravings by revealing to him with certainty his origin and destiny, or by offering relief from the burdens of his soul. The Jews were looking eagerly for the speedy accomplishment of the promises made to their fathers; even among the Gentiles, vague prophecies and expectations of some great appearance in the east were widely current.^b The affairs of the world had been ordered for the furtherance of the Gospel; it was aided in its progress by the dispersion of the Jews, and by the vast extent of the Roman dominion.^c From its birthplace, Jerusalem, it might be carried by pilgrims to the widely scattered settlements in which their race had found a home, and in these Jewish settlements its preachers had an audience to which they might address their first announcements with the hope of being understood. From Rome, where it early took root, it might be diffused by

^a Gal. iv. 4.

^b Sueton. Vespas. 4.

^c Orig. c. Celsus, ii. 30.

means of the continual intercourse which all the provinces of the empire maintained with the capital. It might accompany the course of merchandise, and the movements of the legions.

We learn from the books of the New Testament that within a few years from the day of Pentecost the knowledge of the faith was spread, by the preaching, the miracles, and the life of the Apostles and their associates, through most of the countries which border on the Mediterranean Sea. At Rome, before the city had been visited by any Apostle, the number of Christians was already so great as to form several congregations in the different quarters.^d Clement of Rome states that St. Paul himself, in the last period of his life, visited "the extremity of the west;"^e an expression which may be more probably interpreted of Spain^f (in accordance with the intention expressed in Rom. xv. 28) than of our own island. The early introduction of Christianity into Britain, however, appears more certain than the agency by which it was effected; and the same remark will apply in many other cases.

While St. Paul was engaged in the labours which are related in the Acts of the Apostles, his brethren were doubtless active in their several spheres, although no certain record of their exertions has been preserved. St. Peter is said to have founded the church of Antioch, and, after having presided over it for seven years, to have left Euodius as his successor, while he himself penetrated into Parthia and other countries of the east.^g It seems more reasonable to understand the date of *Babylon* in his First Epistle (v. 13) as meaning the eastern city of that name than as a mystical designation of pagan Rome.^h St. Bartholomew is said to have preached in India and Arabia;ⁱ St. Andrew in Scythia;^k St. Matthew and St. Matthias in Ethiopia. The Church of Alexandria traced itself to St. Mark; that of Milan, but with less warrant,^m to St. Barnabas. St. Philip (either the deacon or the apostle) is supposed to have

^d Rom. xvi.

^e ἐπὶ τὸ τέμα τῆς δύσεως ἰλθὼν. Ad Cor. c. 5. See Dr. Jacobson's note on the passage, PP. Apostol. i. 27; Blunt, 55, 193. Dr. Schaff, who supposes St. Paul's martyrdom to have followed immediately on his first imprisonment at Rome, adopts the conjecture of ὑπὸ for ἐπὶ from Wieseler, and understands the words to mean "having appeared before the highest authorities of the West" (346). But (1) although τέμα may be used for *supreme authority*, there is no evidence that it can mean the *possessors*

of authority, which is the sense required for this construction; and (2) when found in connexion with δύσεως, it must surely bear a geographical sense.

^f Nat. Alex. iv. 372.

^g Hieron. de VV. Illustr. 1; Baron. 39. 18. Against the story of St. Peter's bishoprick at Antioch, see Burton, i. 119; Heinichen in Euseb. iii. 36 (t. i. p. 272).

^h See Wiltsh, Kirchliche Geographie u. Statistik, i. 17.

ⁱ Euseb. v. 10.

^k Ib. iii. 1.

^m Tillem. i. 657

settled at Hierapolis in Phrygia.ⁿ The foundation of the Church of Edessa by St. Thaddeus might perhaps be more readily believed if the story were not connected with a manifestly spurious correspondence between our Saviour and Abgarus, king of that region.^o St. Thomas is reported to have preached in Parthia^p and in India; the Persian Church claimed him for its founder, and the native Church of Malabar advances a similar claim. Put the name of India was so vaguely used that little can be safely inferred from the ancient notices which connect it with the labours of St. Thomas: the more probable opinion appears to be, that the Christianity of Malabar owes its origin to Nestorian missionaries of the fifth century, who carried with them from Persia the name of the apostle of that country, and so laid the foundation of the local tradition.^q The African Church, which afterwards became so prominent in history, has been fabulously traced to St. Peter, and to St. Simon Zelotes; but nothing is known of it with certainty until the last years of the second century, and the Christianity of Africa was most probably derived from Rome by means of teachers whose memory has perished.^r

There may be too much hardness in rejecting traditions, as well as too great easiness in receiving them. Where it is found that a church existed, and that it referred its origin to a certain person, the mere fact that the person in question was as likely as any other to have been the founder, or perhaps more likely than any other, can surely be no good reason for denying the claim. We have before us, on the one hand, remarkable works, and, on the other, distinguished names; tradition may be wrong in connecting the names with the works; but it is an unreasonable scepticism to insist on separating them, without examination and without exception.

Of the personal history of the Apostles we know hardly anything with certainty beyond what is related in Scripture. With the single exception of St. John, it is believed that the whole of the blessed company suffered martyrdom. It is not so much a spirit of sound criticism as a religious prejudice which has led some Protestant writers to deny that St. Peter was ever at Rome,^s where

ⁿ Polycrat. ap. Routh Rel. Sac. ii. 13.

^o Hegesipp. ap. Euseb. i. 13; ii. 1.

^p Eus. iii. 1.

^q See Neander, i. 112-4; Milman, note on Gibbon, iv. 381; Wiltsch, i. 19. Hough's Christianity in India, i. 30-42,

Lond. 1839; Neumann, Gesch. d. englischen Reichs in Asien, ii. 279 (Leipz. 1857).

^r Münter, Primordia Eccl. Africanæ, cc. 3-4. Hafniæ 1829.

^s See Pearson, Minor Works, ii. 327-341; Thiersch, i. 90-3.

all testimony represents him to have suffered, together with St. Paul, in the persecution under Nero.^t

That persecution is one of the circumstances in our early history which are attested by the independent evidence of heathen writers. It has been supposed that Christianity had once before attracted the notice of the imperial government; for it is inferred from a passage in Suetonius that disturbances among the Roman Jews on the subject of Christ had been the occasion of the edict by which

A.D. 64-68. Claudius banished them from Rome.^u But the persecution under Nero was more distinctly directed against the

Christians, on whom the emperor affected to lay the charge of having set fire to the city. Some were sewn up in the skins of wild beasts, and exposed to be torn by dogs; some were crucified; others were covered with a dress which had been smeared with pitch, and was then set on fire, so that the victims served as torches to illuminate the emperor's gardens, while he regaled the populace with the exhibition of chariot-races, in which he himself took part. Tacitus, in relating these atrocities, states that, although the charge of incendiarism was disbelieved, the Christians were unpopular as followers of an unsocial superstition; but that the infliction of such tortures on them raised a general feeling of pity.^x As to the extent of this persecution (which has been a subject of dispute) the most probable opinion appears to be that it had no official sanction beyond the immediate neighbourhood of the capital; but the display of Nero's enmity against the Christian name must doubtless have affected the condition of the obnoxious community throughout the provinces of the empire.^y

The next considerable event in the history is the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. Until that time, the capital of A.D. 77. God's ancient people, the city where the Church had taken its beginning, had naturally been regarded by Christians as a religious centre. It was the scene of the Apostolic Council, held under the presidency of its bishop, St. James "the Just."^z And,

^t E. g. Euseb. ii. 25; Orig. in Gen. t. iii. *ib.* iii. 1; Hieron. de VV. Illustr. 1. See Pusey, n. on Tertullian, i. 471. Bp. Pearson (Minor Works, i. 396) places their martyrdom in A.D. 67 or 68; Mr. Fynes Clinton in A.D. 65 (Fasti Rom. i. 47); Schaff and others (see p. 2. n. e.) in A.D. 64.

^u Acts xviii. 2; Sueton. Claud. 25; Guericke, i. 122.

^x Annal. xv. 44.

^y Mosheim, Instit. Majores, 124-6;

Milman, n. on Gibbon, i. 546; Schaff, i. 351. See Rose, 'Christianity always Progressive,' 139-140, Cambr. 1829. Notices of martyrs who are said to have suffered in various countries during this persecution may be found in Tillemont, ii. 75-7.

^z Acts xv. For the identity of the Bishop of Jerusalem with the Apostle St. James the Less, see Dr. Mill's essay on "Our Lord's Brethren," Cambridge, 1843.

as the embracing of the Gospel was not considered to detach converts of Hebrew race from the Temple-worship and other Mosaic observances, Jerusalem had continued to be a resort for such converts, including the Apostles themselves, at the seasons of the great Jewish festivals. But the destruction of the Temple and of the Holy City put an end to this connexion. It was the final proof that God was no longer with the Israel after the flesh; that the Mosaic system had fulfilled its work, and had passed away.^a At the approach of the besieging army, the Christian community—seeing in this the accomplishment of their Master's warnings—had withdrawn beyond the Jordan to the mountain town of Pella. The main body of them returned after the siege, and established themselves among the ruins, under Symeon, who had been raised to the bishoprick on the martyrdom of St. James, some years before;^b but the Church of Jerusalem no longer stood in its former relation of superiority to other Churches.^c

Thirty years after the time of Nero, a new persecution of the Church, wider in its reach, but of less severity,^e than the former, was instituted by Domitian. Christianity, as it was A.D. 95-6.^d not the faith of any nation, had not, in the eyes of Roman statesmen, a claim to admission among the number of tolerated religions (*religiones licite*); it must, indeed, have refused such a position, if it were required to exist peaceably and without aggression by the side of systems which it denounced as false and ruinous. Hence its professors were exposed to the capricious enmity of rulers who might think fit to proceed against them. The banishment of St. John to Patmos, where he saw the visions recorded in the last book of Holy Scripture, has generally been referred to this persecution.^f Nor does there appear to be any good reason for disbelieving the story that the emperor, having been informed that some descendants of the house of David were living in Judea,

^a Orig. c. Cels. iv. 2; Just. Mart. Dial. c. Tryph. 52.

^b Euseb. iii. 11; Tillem. ii. 187, 575.

^c Gieseler, I. i. 126-9.

^d This is Tillemont's date, ii. 118, 522 Comp. Clinton, p. 80. Baronius and others place the beginning four years earlier.

^e Blunt, 228.

^f Many modern German writers refer the Apocalypse to an earlier date, such as the time of Nero's persecution. (See Gieseler, I. i. 127; Guericke, i. 97.) Hase would refer it, not to any exile in Patmos, but to a residence there in the

reign of Galba (38); but Hengstenberg, Ebrard (Comment. über d. Offenbarung, 131) and Schaff (i. 406-8) maintain the older view. The stories of the Apostle's having been plunged into a caldron of boiling oil (Tert. de Præscr. 36), and of his having drunk a cup of poison (Soliloq. Animæ, c. 22, ap. Augustin. t. vi. Append.), without receiving any hurt, are supposed by Gieseler (I. i. 139) to have arisen from a desire to realise St. Matth. xx. 23. Comp. Olshausen, Commentar, ii. 590. Prof. Blunt is inclined to believe the miraculous deliverance from the caldron, 69.

ordered them to be brought before him, apprehending a renewal of the attempts at rebellion which had been so frequent among their nation. They were two grandchildren of St. Jude—the “brother” of our Lord, as he is called. They showed their hands, rough and horny from labour, and gave such answers as proved them to be simple countrymen, not likely to engage in any plots against the state; whereupon they were dismissed.^g The persecution did not last long. Domitian, before his assassination, had given orders that it should cease, and that the Christians who had been banished should be permitted to return to their homes;^h and the reign of his successor, Nerva (A.D. 96-8), who restored their confiscated property,ⁱ was a season of rest for the Church.

St. John alone of the Apostles survived to the reign of Trajan.^k Of his last years, which were spent in the superintendence of the Ephesian church,^m some traditions have been preserved, which, if they cannot absolutely demand our belief, have at least a sufficient air of credibility to deserve a respectful consideration. One of these is a pleasing story of his recovering to the way of righteousness a young man who had fallen into vicious courses, and had become captain of ‘a band of robbers.’ⁿ Another tradition relates that, when too feeble to enter the church without assistance, or to utter many words, he continually addressed his flock with the charge—“Little children, love one another;” and that, when some of them ventured to ask the reason of a repetition which they found wearisome, he answered, “Because it is the Lord’s commandment, and, if this only be performed, it is enough.”^o And it is surely a very incomplete view of the Apostle’s character which would reject as improbable the story of his having rushed out of a public bath in horror and indignation on finding it to be polluted by the presence of the heretic Cerinthus.^p

Of the writings ascribed to this age, but which have not been admitted into the canon of the New Testament, the First Epistle of St. Clement is the only one which is generally received as genuine. The author, who is supposed to be the Clement of Philippians iv. 3, was bishop of Rome towards the end of the century.^q His epistle was written to the Church of Corinth, on

^g Hegesippus, ap. Euseb. iii. 20. See Dr. Routh’s notes on the passage, Reliq. Sacræ, i. 249, seqq.

^h Tertull. Apol. 5; Euseb. iii. 20. See Mosh. 112.

ⁱ Dio Cassius, lxxviii. init.

^k Clinton, A.D. 100.

^m Euseb. iii. 1.

ⁿ Clem. Alex. Quis Div. salv. 42; Euseb. iii. 23.

^o Hieron. in Galat. vi. 10. (t. viii. 433.)

^p Irenæus, III. iii. 4. (Comp. St. John, Epp. ii.-iii.) Epiphanius names Ebion instead of Cerinthus. Hær. xxx. 24.

^q I do not venture to enter into the

an occasion of which no other record is preserved, but probably after the persecution under Domitian: ^r the chief object of it is to recommend humility and peace. The Second Epistle ascribed to Clement is rejected by most critics; and the other writings with which his name is connected are undoubtedly spurious.^s The epistle which bears the name of St. Barnabas (although it does not claim him for its author),^t and the 'Shepherd' of Hermas,^u are probably works of the earlier half of the second century.

Before leaving the apostolic age, a few words must be said on the subject of Church-government, while some other matters of this time are better reserved for notice at such points of the later history as may afford us a view of their bearings and consequences.

With respect, then, to the government of the earliest Church, the most important consideration appears to be, that the Christian ministry was developed, not from below, but from above. We do not find that the first members of it raised some from among their number to a position higher than the equality on which they had all originally stood; but, on the contrary, that the Apostles, having been at first the sole depositaries of their Lord's commission, with all the powers which it conferred, afterwards delegated to others, as their substitutes, assistants, or successors, such

controversy as to the succession of the earliest bishops of Rome. Some of our divines (as Thorndike, i. 25, ed. Ang. Cath. Lib., and Hammond, *Minor Works*, ib. 238) suppose that at Rome, as at Antioch, there were at first one line of bishops for the Jewish and another for the Gentile Christians. But see Pearson's *Dissertations*, pt. ii. cc. 4-5, in *Minor Works*, vol. ii. pp. 449-460.

^r Rothe supposes it written during a vacancy of the see of Corinth, in which a democratic party rebelled against the presbyters. So Thiersch, i. 343-4.

^s The Clementine Homilies and Recognitions are supposed to be the work of an Ebionite of the party inclining to Gnosticism. See Neander, i. 493, and 'Die Clementinen,' by Schliemann. On the "Apostolical" Canons and Constitutions (with which also the name of Clement is connected) see Beveridge, *Cod. Canon. Vindicatus*; Krabbe, *Ursprung u. Inhalt d. Apost. Constitutionen*, Hamb. 1829; v. Drey, *Neue Untersuchungen über die Const. u. Kanones der Apostel*, Tubing 1832; Gieseler, i. i. 356.

^t Neander considers this epistle to be the work of a converted Alexandrian Jew, and written in a tone "more consonant with the spirit of Philo than that of St. Paul, or even of the Epistle to the Hebrews" (ii. 406). It has been referred by some to the reign of Hadrian. (Keble, in *Tracts for the Times*, No. 89, p. 16.) Guericke is in favour of its genuineness (i. 211); and I have been somewhat surprised by finding that Gieseler is of the same opinion. (I. i. 146.) For a list of authorities on each side see Schliemann, 415.

^u This is ascribed to the Hermas who is mentioned in Rom. xvi. 14. It has also been attributed to a person of the same name, who was brother of Pius I., bishop of Rome (about A.D. 150). Neander remarks that the respect paid to it by writers very near that period (such as Clement of Alexandria) "can hardly be reconciled with the hypothesis of so late an origin" (ii. 411). Perhaps it belongs to the interval between the first and the second Hermas. See Hase, 42

portions of their powers as were capable of being transmitted, and as were necessary for the continuance of the Church.

In this way were appointed, first, the order of deacons, for the discharge of secular administrations and of the lower spiritual functions; next, that of presbyters, elders, or bishops, for the ordinary care of congregations; and, lastly, the highest powers of ordination and government were in like manner imparted, as the Apostles began to find that their own body was, from its smallness, unequal to the local superintendence of the growing Church, and as the approach of their end warned them to provide for the coming times. An advocate of the episcopal theory of apostolical succession is not, I conceive, obliged to argue that there must needs have been three orders in the ministry, or that there need have been more than one. It is enough to say that those to whom the Apostles conveyed the full powers of the Christian ministry were not the deacons, nor the presbyters, but (in the later meaning of the word) the bishops; and the existence of the inferior orders, as subject to these, is a simple matter of history.

Resting on the fact that the Apostles were, during their lives on earth, the supreme regulating authorities of the Church, we may disregard a multitude of questions which have been made to tell against the theories of an episcopal polity, of a triple ministry, or of any ministry whatever as distinguished from the great body of Christians. We need not here inquire at what time and by what steps the title of *Bishop*, which had at first been common to the highest and the second orders, came to be applied exclusively to the former; nor whether functions originally open to all Christian men were afterwards restricted to a particular class; nor in how far the inferior orders of the clergy, or the whole body of the faithful, may have shared in the administration of government and discipline; nor whether the commissions given by St. Paul to Timothy and to Titus were permanent or only occasional; nor at what time the system of fixed diocesan bishops was introduced. We do not refuse to acknowledge that the organisation of the Church was gradual; we are only concerned to maintain that it was directed by the Apostles (probably acting on instructions committed to them by their master during the interval between his resurrection and his ascension),^x and that in all essential points it was completed before their departure.

It is evident that the ministers of the Church, beginning with

^x Blunt, 9-14.

St. Matthias, were usually chosen by the body of believers; but it seems to me equally clear that it was the apostolical ordination which gave them their commission—that commission being derived from the Head of the Church, who had bestowed it on the Apostles, that they might become the channels for conveying it to others.^y

Of the universal supremacy of the Bishop of Rome it is unnecessary here to speak. In this stage of Church-history it is a matter not for the narrator but for the controversialist; if indeed the new Romish theories of our day may not be regarded as dispensing even the controversial opponents of Rome from the necessity of proving that, in the earliest times of Christianity, no such supremacy was known or imagined.

^y See Rothe, *Anfänge der Christlichen Kirche* (who supposes episcopacy, properly so called, to have been established by the surviving Apostles after the fall of Jerusalem); Gladstone's

Church Principles, chap. v.; Thiersch, i. 258, seqq.; Bp. Kaye on the Government and Discipline of the Church, 26-43; Blunt on the Fathers, Ser. ii., Lect. 7.

CHAPTER II.

THE REIGNS OF TRAJAN AND HADRIAN.

A.D. 98-138.

CHRISTIANITY was no longer to be confounded with Judaism. The great majority of the converts were of Gentile race; and the difference of manners and observances between the followers of the two religions was such as could not be overlooked when exhibited in large bodies of persons. But still the newer system was regarded as an offshoot of the older; its adherents were exposed to all the odium of a Jewish sect. Indeed the Christian religion must have appeared the more objectionable of the two, since it not only was exclusive, but, instead of being merely or chiefly national, it claimed the allegiance of all mankind.^a

Strange and horrible charges began to be current against the Christians. The secrecy of their meetings for worship was ascribed, not to its true cause, the fear of persecution, but to a consciousness of abominations which could not bear the light. "Thyestean banquets," promiscuous intercourse of the sexes, and magical rites were popularly imputed to them.^b The Jews were especially industrious in inventing and propagating such stories,^c while some of the heretical parties, which now began to vex the Church, both brought discredit on the Christian name by their own practices, and were forward to join in the work of slander and persecution against the faithful.^d And no doubt, among the orthodox themselves, there must have been some by whom the Gospel had been so misconceived, that their behaviour towards those without the Church was repulsive and irritating, so as to give countenance

^a Planck, *Christl. Gesellschaftsverfassung*, i. 58.

^b Justin. Mart. Apol. i. 26. The charge of Thyestean feasts is traced to the misunderstanding of the heathens, who, in endeavouring to get information from the slaves of Christians, could only discover that these had heard their masters speak of eating the Saviour's body and drinking his blood. Irenæus, *Fragm.*

t. i. p. 852. See most of the charges in Minucius Felix, 'Octavius,' cc. 9. seqq., and the refutation, cc. 28-32.

^c Just. Mart. Dial. c. Tryph. 17; Orig. c. Cels. vi. 27.

^d Burton, i. 310; Pusey, n. on Tertullian, i. 5. Clement of Alexandria charges the Carpocratians with the abominations which were falsely imputed to the Church. Strom. iii. 2, p. 514.

to the prejudices which regarded the faith of Christ as a gloomy and unsocial superstition.^e

It is a question whether at this time there were any laws of the Roman empire against Christianity. On the one hand, it has been maintained that those of Nero and Domitian had been repealed;^f on the other hand, Tertullian^g states that although all the other acts of Nero were abrogated, those against the Christians still remained; and the records of the period convey the idea that the profession of the Gospel was legally punishable. Even if it was no longer condemned by any special statute, it fell under the general law which prohibited all such religions as had not been formally sanctioned by the state.^h And this law, although it might usually be allowed to slumber, could at any time be enforced; not to speak of the constant danger from popular tumults, often incited by persons who felt that their calling was at stake—priests, sooth-sayers, statuaries, players, gladiators, and others who depended for a livelihood on the worship of the heathen gods, or on spectacles which the Christians abhorred.ⁱ

Trajan, the successor of Nerva, although stained with serious personal vices,^k was long regarded by the Romans as the ideal of an excellent prince; centuries after his death, the highest wish that could be framed for the salutation of a new emperor was a prayer that he might be “more fortunate than Augustus and better than Trajan.”^m In the history of the Church, however, his appearance is less advantageous. Early in his reign he issued an edict against societies or clubs (*Hæterice*),ⁿ apprehending that they might become dangerous to the state; and it is easy to imagine how this edict might be turned against the Christians—a vast brotherhood, extending through all known countries, both within and beyond the empire, bound together by intimate ties, maintaining a lively intercourse and communication with each other, and having much that was mysterious both in their opinions and in their practice.^o

In this reign falls the martyrdom of the venerable Symeon, the

^e Neander, i. 126.

^f Mosh. 231; Gibbon, i. 550.

^g Apol. 6; Ad Nationes, i. 7. See Blunt on the Fathers, 341-5.

^h See Tillemont, ii. 168; and note on Mosh. i. 133. Comp. Bp. Kaye on Tertullian, 109, seqq.

ⁱ Tzschirner, Der Fall des Heidenthums, 227. Comp. Tertull. Apol. 42-3. A lively view of this professional enmity is given by Prof. Blunt, c. viii.

^k Tillem., Hist. des Emp. iii. 162.

^m Gibbon, i. 82.

ⁿ “Secundum mandata tua, hæterias esse vetueram.” Plin. ad Traj. Ep. x. 97. See Ep. x. 36; Augusti, viii. 76.

^o The additional ground of apprehension stated by Baronius (100. 9), that they were subject to one central head, appears to have been a discovery of his own.

kinsman of our Lord, brother of James the Just, and his successor in the see of Jerusalem. It is said that some heretics denounced him to the proconsul Atticus as a Christian and a descendant of David. During several days he endured a variety of tortures with a constancy which astonished the beholders; and at last he was crucified, at the age of a hundred and twenty.^p

A curious and interesting contribution to the Church history of the time is furnished by the correspondence of the younger Pliny.^q He had been sent as proconsul into Pontus and Bithynia, a region of mixed population, partly Asiatic and partly Greek, with a considerable infusion of Jews.^r That the Gospel had early found an entrance into those countries appears from the address of St. Peter's First Epistle;^s and its prevalence there in the second century is confirmed by the testimony of the heathen Lucian.^t The circumstances of his government forced on Pliny the consideration of a subject which had not before engaged his attention. Perhaps, as has been conjectured,^u the first occasion which brought the new religion under his notice may have been the celebration of Trajan's *Quindecennalia*—the fifteenth anniversary of his adoption as the heir of the empire; for solemnities of this kind were accompanied by pagan rites, in which it was unlawful for Christians to share.

Pliny was perplexed by the novelty of the circumstances with which he had to deal. The temples of the national religion were almost deserted. The persons accused of Christianity were very numerous; they were of every age, of both sexes, of all ranks, and were found not only in the towns but in villages and country places. He was uncertain as to the state of the laws;^x and he applied to the emperor for instructions. He states the course which he had pursued: he had questioned the accused repeatedly; of those who persisted in avowing themselves Christians, he had ordered some to be put to death, and had reserved others, who were entitled to the privileges of Roman citizens, with the intention of sending them

^p Hegesipp. ap. Euseb. iii. 32. The date was A.D. 107, according to most authorities; 104 according to Burton, ii. 17; while Mosheim (234) places it so late as 116. The addition of Hegesippus, that Symeon's accusers were themselves put to death as descendants of David, has a fabulous air.

^q Epp. x. 97-8. The genuineness of these letters has, of course, been denied, but seemingly without any good grounds. They are referred by Pagi to the years

111-112; by Mr. Clinton to 104.

^r Milman, ii. 140.

^s Comp. Acts ii. 9.

^t Lucian. Alexander, c. 25 (t. ii. ed. Hemsterh.); Mosh. 219.

^u By Pagi, ii. 31. See Milman, ii. 141; Burton, ii. 40.

^x Hence Gibbon (i. 550) infers that there were no laws by which the Christians could be punished; but see for the contrary, Milman, i. 141-3; Blunt, 159, 230.

to the capital. "I had no doubt," he says, "that, whatever they might confess, wilfulness and inflexible obstinacy ought to be punished." Many who were anonymously accused had cleared themselves by invoking the gods, by offering incense to the statues of these and of the emperor, and by cursing the name of Christ. Some, who had at first admitted the charge, afterwards declared that they had abandoned Christianity three, or even twenty, years before;^y yet the governor was unable to extract from these anything to the discredit of the faith which they professed to have forsaken. They stated that they had been in the habit of meeting before dawn on certain days; that they sang alternately a hymn^z to Christ as God. Instead of the expected disclosures as to seditious engagements, licentious orgies, and unnatural feasts, Pliny could only find that they bound themselves by an oath to abstain from theft, adultery, and breach of promise or trust;^a and that at a second meeting, later in the day, they partook in common of a simple and innocent meal (the *agape* or *love-feast*, connected with the Eucharist). He put two deaconesses^b to the torture; but even this cruelty failed to draw forth evidence of anything more criminal than "a perverse and immoderate superstition." In these circumstances Pliny refers his difficulties to the emperor. He asks, with what penalties Christianity shall be visited; whether it shall be punished as in itself a crime, or only when found in combination with other offences; whether any difference shall be made between the treatment of the young and tender, and that of the more robust culprits; and whether a recantation shall be admitted as a title to pardon. He concludes by stating that the measures already taken had recovered many worshippers for the lately deserted temples, and by expressing the belief that a wise and moderate policy would produce far more numerous reconversions.

^y The period of twenty years probably refers to the persecution under Domitian. (Pagi, ii. 31.) The equivocal behaviour of these persons leaves it doubtful whether they really apostatized, or whether they used the license which was sanctioned by some heretical sects (see below, c. iv.) and disavowed their belief in order to escape danger.

^z "Carmen . . . dicere secum invicem." I cannot think that the current charges against the Christians prove the word *carmen* here to mean a *charm*, as is said by Dr. Newman, *Essay on Development*, 225.

^a This, although represented as a part

of the ordinary worship, may probably be understood to refer to the baptismal vow. Bishop Beveridge (*Cod. Canon. Vindic.* l. II. c. iii. § 7) supposes "sacramentum" here to mean the Eucharist. But the following words seem to show that the eucharistic service was in the evening. Tertullian, in referring to this passage, says, "ad confederandam disciplinam" (*Apol.* 2); and Augusti understands the reading and application of Scriptures which forbid the sins in question (*iv.* 35).

^b "Ancillis quæ ministræ dicebantur." See Augusti, *iv.* 30.

Trajan, in his answer, approves of the measures which Pliny had reported to him. He prefers intrusting the governor with a large discretionary power to laying down a rigid and uniform rule for all cases. The Christians, he says, are not to be sought out; if detected and convicted, they are to be punished; but a denial of Christ is to be admitted as clearing the accused; and no anonymous informations are to be received against them.

The policy indicated in these letters has been assailed by the sarcasm of Tertullian,^b and his words have often been echoed and quoted with approbation by later writers—forgetful that the conduct of Trajan and his minister ought to be estimated, not by the standard either of true religion or of correct and consistent reasoning, but as that of heathen statesmen. We may deplore the insensibility which led these eminent men to set down our faith as a wretched fanaticism, instead of being drawn by the moral beauty of the little which they were able to ascertain to a deeper inquiry which might have ended in their own conversion. We may dislike the merely political view which, without taking any cognizance of religious truth, regarded religion only as an affair of state, and punished dissent from the legal system as a crime against the civil authority. We may pity the blindness which was unable to discern the inward and spiritual strength of Christianity, and supposed that a judicious mixture of indulgence and severity would in no long time extinguish it. But if we fairly consider the position from which Trajan and Pliny were obliged to regard the question, instead of joining in the apologist's complaints against the logical inconsistency of their measures, we shall be unable to refuse the praise of wise liberality to the system of conniving at the existence of the new religion, unless when it should be so forced on the notice of the government as to require the execution of the laws.^c

The next^d event to be related is the martyrdom of Ignatius

^b "O sententiam necessitate confusam! negat inquirendos, ut innocentes; et mandat puniendos, ut nocentes," etc. Apol. 2.

^c Schröckh, ii. 335; Neander, i. 136.

^d It is placed by Ussher, Tillemont, and Burton in 107; by Baronius in 110. Pagi (ii. 45-8) says that it cannot have been earlier than 112, and inclines to date it in 116, which is the year given by Pearson, Lloyd, Grabe, Schröckh, and Gieseler. Mr. Fynes Clinton's date is 115. Mosheim, who gives the latest of these dates, and refers the martyrdom of Symeon to the same year, begs the question of chronological order, by

saying that the rescript of Trajan to Pliny became the law of the empire, and that these were instances of its being enforced (234-5). It would be more correct to say that they were in conformity with the *principles* laid down in the rescript; which might have been the case, although they were earlier in date than it. It is, however, difficult to reconcile the tone of the Bithynian letters with the supposition that the death of Ignatius—sentenced by the emperor in person—had taken place before. If the condemnation of Ignatius was in 116, an earthquake which had done great injury at Antioch in 115 may help to

—one of the most celebrated facts in early Church History, not only on its own account, but because of the interest attached to the epistles which bear the name of the venerable bishop.^e The birth-place of Ignatius is matter of conjecture, and his early history is unknown. He is described as a hearer of St. John;^f and he was raised to the bishoprick of Antioch, as the successor of Euodius, about the year 70. For nearly half a century he had governed that Church, seated in the capital of Syria, a city which numbered 200,000 inhabitants; and to the authority of his position was added that of a wise and saintly character.

It is uncertain to which of the visits which Trajan paid to Antioch the fate of Ignatius ought to be referred. The Acts of his Martyrdom^g relate that he “was voluntarily led” before the

account for a popular excitement against the Christians at that time. On the whole, I have preferred a late date; but for this it is necessary to suppose the Acts of the Martyrdom to be interpolated in the passage which refers it to the consulship of Sura and Senecio.

^e The history of these must be shortly stated. Until the middle of the seventeenth century, besides some epistles which existed only in Latin, and were undoubtedly spurious, there were twelve in Greek, which laboured under great suspicion of forgery or interpolation. (See *Centur. Magd.* ii. 127–8.) Archbishop Ussher attempted to restore the genuine epistles by the help of two Latin MSS. (1644); and about the same time Isaac Vossius discovered at Florence a Greek MS. which agreed very closely with the text produced by Ussher's critical skill. This MS. exhibited seven epistles, considerably shorter than those of the same names which had before been known—these having been swelled by interpolations; and the remaining five epistles were adjudged to be spurious. The “shorter recension” was defended against Dailé in the celebrated work of Bishop Pearson (1672); and from that time the seven epistles—although questioned by controversialists who disliked their testimony on the subject of Church-government, and suspected by some other critics of having been more or less corrupted—have been generally received as, on the whole, genuine remains of the Apostolical Father. Within the last few years, however, a new controversy has sprung up from the discovery of a Syriac MS., which contains *three* epistles, shorter than the corresponding Greek epistles

of the Florentine copy. The editor of the three, the Rev. W. Cureton, contends that they alone are genuine; while on the other side it is maintained that they are not complete translations, but abridgments, and that they do not afford any good reason for rejecting the remaining four. The result appears to be, that in our own country, while Mr. Cureton's industry and oriental learning are very amply acknowledged, his knowledge of Christian antiquity is less highly estimated, and his reasoning is generally rejected (see Prof. Hussey's Preface to *Academical Sermons*; the *Quarterly Review* for Dec. 1850; Archdeacon Churton's Preface to Pearson's *Vindiciæ*, ed. Ang. Cath. Lib.; and Prof. Blunt's 11th chapter); and that in Germany, where Baron Bunsen has introduced the three epistles in their new form, the more sober critics prefer that which had been before known as the *shorter recension*, while Baur, who maintains that the whole are spurious, is yet in so far decidedly against the patrons of the Syriac version that he declares it to be an abridgment of the Greek. It may be here noted as a curious fact, and one which does not tend to increase our confidence in the oracles of criticism, that the Epistle to Polycarp, which had been pointed out by Mosheim (*Instit.* 220–2; *De R. Chr.* 159) and Neander (*ii.* 411) as the most suspicious of the *seven*, is one of the *three* which Mr. Cureton admits as genuine. A very temperate summary of the controversy may be found in Prof. Chevallier's *Translation of Clement, &c.*, Camb. 1851, pp. xxxiv. seq.

^f Hieron. de *Viris Illustr.*, c. 16.

^g Neander suspects these altogether

emperor—an expression which may mean either that he was led as a criminal, without attempting resistance or escape; or that he himself desired to be conducted into Trajan's presence, with a view of setting forth the case of the Christians, and with the resolution, if his words should fail of success, to sacrifice himself for his faith and for his people.^h The details of the scene with the emperor are suspicious, as the speeches attributed to Trajan are too much in the vein of a theatric tyrant; his sentence was, that Ignatius should be carried to Rome, and there exposed to wild beasts. Perhaps the Emperor may have hoped to overcome the constancy of the aged bishop by the fatigues of the long journey, and the terrors of the death which awaited him. At least we may suppose him to have reckoned on striking fear into other Christians, by the spectacle of a man so venerable in character and so eminent in place, hurried over sea and land to a dreadful and degrading death,—the punishment of the lowest criminals, and especially of persons convicted of those magical practices which were commonly imputed to the Christians.ⁱ Perhaps he may even have thought that the exemplary punishment of one conspicuous leader would operate as a mercy to the multitude; and we find in fact that, while the victim was on his way to Rome, his Church, which he had left to the charge of God as its pastor, was allowed to remain in peace.^k

Ignatius, who had welcomed his condemnation, and had willingly submitted to be bound, was committed to the charge of ten soldiers, who treated him with great harshness.^m They conducted him to Seleucia, and thence by sea to Smyrna, where he was received by the bishop, Polycarp—like himself a disciple of St. John, and destined to be a martyr for the Gospel. The report of his sentence, and of his intended route, had reached the churches of Asia; and from several of these deputations of bishops and clergy had been sent to Smyrna, with the hope of mingling with him in Christian consolation, and perhaps of receiving some spiritual gift from him.ⁿ He charged the bishops of Ephesus, Magnesia, and Tralles with letters addressed to their respective churches; and, as some members of the Ephesian church were proceeding to Rome by a more direct way than that which he was himself about to take, he seized the opportunity of writing by them to his brethren in the

(i. 139). The concluding part is given up by many critics. See Jacobson, PP. Apostol. pp. 534–7.

^h Le Clerc, in Jacobson, 515.

ⁱ Burton, ii. 26.

^k Ignat. ad Rom. 9; ad Polyc. 7.

^m Ad Rom. 5.

ⁿ Acta S. Ign. 3. See Jacobson, 523, and Burton, ii. 26, 231.

capital. At Troas he was met by the bishop of Philadelphia; and thence he wrote to that church, as also to the Smyrnæans, and to their bishop, Polycarp.

The epistles to the churches are in general full of solemn and affectionate exhortation. The venerable writer recalls to the minds of his readers the great truths of the Gospel—dwelling with especial force on the reality of our Lord's manhood, and of the circumstances of His history, by way of warning against the errors of the Docetism which had begun to infest the Asiatic churches even during the lifetime of St. John. A tendency to Judaism (or rather to heresies of a judaizing character) is also repeatedly denounced. Submission to the episcopal authority is strongly inculcated throughout. Ignatius charges the churches to do nothing without their bishops; he compares the relation of presbyters to bishops with that of the strings to the harp; he exhorts that obedience be given to the bishops as to Christ himself, and to the Almighty Father. The frequent occurrence of such exhortations, and the terms in which the episcopal office is extolled, have been the chief inducements to question the genuineness of the Epistles altogether, or to suppose that they have been largely interpolated with the view of serving a hierarchical interest.^o It must, however, be remembered that the question is not whether a ministry of three orders was by this time organised, but merely whether Ignatius' estimation of the episcopal dignity were somewhat higher or lower; and it has been truly remarked^p that the intention of the passages in question is not to exalt the

^o "Nulla forte lis plerisque Ignatianarum epistolarum mota fuisset, nisi qui pro divina origine et antiquitate gubernationis episcopalis pugnant, caussam suam ex illis fulcire potuissent. Hoc vero quomodo intelligerent Presbyteriani qui dicuntur, ex nostris etiam illi, qui omne id evertendum esse arbitrantur, quod ecclesiæ doctoribus utilitatis ali-quod ad suam a populo distinctionem probandam afferre potest, tanto impetu has epistolas aggressi sunt, ut existimationi nonnumquam suæ et laudi, magis quam earum auctoritati, nocuerint." (Mosh. 160.) In like manner, Neander (i. 266) and Baur reject the Epistles altogether, because they disagree with their views as to the origin of Church-government, while Baron Bunsen relies on the three of the Syriac version, as harmonising with his ideas of ecclesiastical polity; nor does the learned Mr. Green-

wood appear to be free from similar motives, (*Cathedra Petri*, 67-75.) See *Quart. Rev.* lxxxviii. 78; also Dörner's remarks (*Lehre v. d. Person Christi*, i. 157, note) on Neander's way of dealing with the Epistles; and Möhler's *Athanasius*, i. 18-9, as to the prejudice by which anti-episcopal writers have been influenced in the case. Mr. Cureton is, indeed, free from such prejudices, since he both professes that "no one can be more sincerely and warmly devoted to our Church system," than himself, and points out that even *his* version contains "incidental and consequently unsuspected evidence," for that system (*Corpus Ignatianum*, Pref. xv.-xvi.) But may not the judgment of the most unprejudiced and honest man be warped by partiality to his own discoveries?

^p Mosh. *Instit.* 222; Milman, iii. 361.

hierarchy, but to persuade to Christian unity, of which the episcopate was the visible keystone.

The Epistle to the Romans is written in a more ardent strain than the others. In it Ignatius bears witness to the faith and the good deeds of the Church of Rome. He expresses an eager desire for the crown of martyrdom, and entreats that the Romans will not, through mistaken kindness, attempt to prevent his fate. "I am," he says, "the wheat of God; let me be ground by the teeth of beasts, that I may be found the pure bread of Christ. Rather do you encourage the beasts, that they may become my tomb, and may leave nothing of my body, so that when dead I may not be troublesome to any one." He declares that he wishes the lions to exercise all their fierceness on him; that if, as in some other cases, they should show any unwillingness, he will himself provoke them to fall on him.

It has been asked whether these expressions were agreeable to the spirit of the Gospel.^a Surely we need not hesitate to answer. The aspirations of a tried and matured saint are not to be classed with that headstrong spirit which at a later time led some persons to provoke persecution and death, so that the Church saw fit to restrain it by refusing the honours of martyrdom to those who should suffer in consequence of their own violence.^r Rather they are to be regarded as a repetition of St. Paul's "readiness to be offered up;" of his desire "to depart and be with Christ." To a man like Ignatius, such a death might reasonably seem as a token of the acceptance of his labours; while it afforded him an opportunity of signally witnessing to the Gospel, and becoming an offering for his flock.^s

From Troas he sailed to Neapolis in Macedonia; thence he crossed the continent to Epidamnus, where he again embarked; and, after sailing round the south of Italy, he landed at Portus (Porto), near Ostia. His keepers hurried him towards Rome—fearing lest they should not arrive in time for the games at which it was intended to expose him. On the way he was met by some brethren from the city, whom he entreated, even more earnestly than in his letter, that they would do nothing to avert his death; and, after having prayed in concert with them for the peace of the Church, and for the continuance of love among the faithful, he was

^a Barbeyrac, *De la Moralité des Pères*, l. viii. c. 39 (p. 126, Amsterd. 1728); Gibbon, i. 562.

^r See Gieseler, I. i. 248, 411; Blunt

on the Fathers, 231-242.

^s See Pearson, *Vindiciæ Ignatianæ*, p. ii. c. 9 (pp. 477, seqq., ed. Churton); Cureton, *Corpus Ignat.*, 321-2.

carried to the amphitheatre, where he suffered in the sight of the crowds assembled on the last day of the Sigillaria—a festival attached to the Saturnalia.^t It is related that, agreeably to the wish which he had expressed, no part of his body was left, except a few of the larger and harder bones; and that these were collected by his brethren, and reverently conveyed to Antioch, being received with honour by the churches on the way.^u

Within a few months after the martyrdom of Ignatius (if the late date of it be correct), Trajan was succeeded by Hadrian.^x The new emperor—able, energetic, inquisi-^{August, 117.} tive, and versatile, but capricious, paradoxical, and a slave to a restless vanity^y—was not likely to appreciate Christianity rightly. It is, however, altogether unjust to class him among the persecutors of the Church (as was once the practice); for there is no ground for supposing him to have been personally concerned in the persecutions which took place during the earlier years of his reign, and under him the condition of the Christians was greatly improved.^z

The rescript of Trajan to Pliny had both its favourable and its unfavourable side: while it discouraged anonymous and false informations, it distinctly recognised the profession of the Gospel as a crime to be punished on conviction; and very soon a way was found to deprive the Christians of such protection as they might have hoped to derive from the hazardous nature of the informer's office. They were no longer attacked by individual accusers; but at public festivals the multitudes assembled in the amphitheatres learnt to call for a sacrifice of the Christians, as wretches whose impiety was the cause of floods and earthquakes, of plagues, famines, and defeats; and it was seldom that a governor dared to refuse the demand.^a

A visit of Hadrian to Athens,^b when he was initiated in the mysteries of Eleusis, excited the heathen inhabitants with the hope of gratifying their hatred of the Christians, and the occasion induced two of these, Quadratus, who had been an *evangelist*, or missionary,^c and Aristides, a converted philosopher, to address the

^t Dec. 20. Tillem. ii. 208.

^u There is, however, in this nothing like the honours which were paid to relics in later times.

^x Tillem. Hist. des Emp. ii. 210.

^y See Spartian. Vit. Hadr. 17. seq.

^z Lampridius says that Hadrian intended to acknowledge Christ among the Gods, and with that view built temples without any statues. (Vit. Alex.

Sev. 43.) But this is generally considered to be a mistake. See Cieseler, I. ii. 173.

^a Baron. 127. 1.; Mosh. 236; Gibbon, i. 552.

^b A.D. 125, Clinton. Tzschirner (202) places it in 131.

^c Some (as Cave, Hist. Lit. i. 31, and Tzschirner, 202) identify him with a Quadratus who was bishop of Athens.

emperor in written arguments for their religion. The "Apologies" appear to have been well received; and they became the first in a series of works which powerfully and effectively set forth the truth of the Gospel, in contrast with the fables and the vices of Paganism.^d

About the same time a plea for justice and toleration was offered by a heathen magistrate. Serennius Granianus, when about to leave the proconsulship of Asia, represented to Hadrian the atrocities which were committed in compliance with the popular clamours against the Christians; and the emperor, in consequence, addressed letters to Minucius Fundanus, the successor of Granianus, and to other provincial governors.^e He orders that the Christians should no longer be given up to the outcries of the multitude; if convicted of any offence, they are to be sentenced according to their deserts; but the forms of law must be duly observed, and unfounded charges are to be severely punished.

This rescript was valuable, as affording protection against a new form of persecution; but it was still far from establishing a complete toleration, since it omitted to define whether Christianity were in itself a crime, and thus left the matter to the discretion or caprice of the local magistrates.^f

The reign of Hadrian was very calamitous for the Jews. In the last years of Trajan there had been Jewish insurrections in Egypt, Cyprus, Mesopotamia, and elsewhere, which had been put down with great severity, and had drawn fresh oppressions on the whole people.^g By these, and especially by the insult which Hadrian offered to their religion, in settling a Roman colony on the site of the Holy City, the Jews of Palestine were
A.D. 132-5.

excited to a formidable revolt, under a leader who assumed the name of Barcochab,^h and was believed by his followers to be the Messiah. After a protracted and very bloody war, the revolt was suppressed. Many Jews were put to death, some were sold at the price of horses, others were transported from the land of their fathers; and no Jew was allowed to approach Jerusalem except on one day in the year—the anniversary of the capture by Titus, when, for a heavy payment, they were admitted to mourn over the seat of their fallen greatness. The Roman city of Ælia Capitolina was built on the foundations of Jerusalem; a

^d See Tillem. Hist. des Emp. ii. 331-4; Routh, Reliquiæ Sacræ, i. 72-3; Neander, i. 139.

^e Just. Mart. Apol. i. 68.

^f See Mosh. de Rebus Christ. 238;

Neander, i. 140-1; Routh, i. 73; Milman, ii. 155.

^g Tillem. Hist. des Emp. ii. 303-4.

^h *Son of a Star* (with a reference to Numbers xxiv. 17).

temple of Jupiter defiled Mount Zion; and it is said that profanations of a like kind were committed in the places hallowed by the birth, the death, and the burial of our Lord.^l

While the revolt was as yet successful, the Christians of Palestine suffered severely for refusing to acknowledge Bar-cochab.^k The measures of Hadrian, after its suppression, A.D. 138. led to an important change in the church of Jerusalem. Wishing visibly to disconnect themselves from the Jews, the majority of its members abandoned the Mosaic usages which they had until then retained. They chose for the first time a bishop of Gentile race, and conformed to the practice of Gentile churches. On these conditions they were allowed to reside in Ælia, while such of their brethren as still adhered to the distinctively Jewish Christianity retired to Pella and other places beyond the Jordan, where their fathers had found a refuge during the siege of Jerusalem by Titus.^m

^l Just. Mart. Apol. i. 47; Dial. c. 305-314.

Tryph. 16; Euseb. iv. 6; Vit. Const.

iii. 26; Hieron. in Sophoniam, i. 16.

(t. vi. 1554); Tillem. Hist. des Emp. ii.

^k Just. Apol. i. 31.

^m Euseb. iv. 6; v. 12; Tillem. Hist. des Empereurs, ii. 312.

CHAPTER III.

THE REIGNS OF THE ANTONINES.

A.D. 138-180.

THE rescripts of the last two emperors had done much for the protection of the Christians; and their condition was yet further improved during the peaceful reign of the elder Antoninus.

Finding that the provincial governors in general refused to punish the profession of the Gospel as in itself criminal, its enemies now had recourse to charges of atheism—an imputation which seems to have originated in the circumstance that the Christians were without the usual externals of worship, temples and altars, images and sacrifices.^a The custom of ascribing all public calamities to them, and of calling for their blood as an atonement to the offended gods, still continued; and the magistrates of several cities in Greece requested the emperor's directions as to the course which should be taken in consequence. Antoninus wrote in reply, confirming the edict of Hadrian, that the Christians should not be punished, unless for crimes against the state.^b Another document,^c however, in which he is represented as instructing the Council of Asia to put to death all who should molest the Christians on account of their religion, is now generally regarded as spurious.^d

The cause of the persecuted body was pleaded by Justin, usually styled Martyr, in an apology addressed to the emperor, his adopted sons, the senate, and the people of Rome.^e Justin was a native of Flavia Neapolis, a town of Greek population and language, on the site of the ancient Sychem, in Samaria.^f He has himself, in his Dialogue with the Jew Trypho, related the progress of his religious opinions; how—induced, as it would seem, rather by a

^a Mosh. 239; Tzschirner, 228.

^b Melito ap. Euseb. iv. 26.

^c Euseb. iv. 13.

^d Tzschirner, 304; Gieseler, I. i. 174; Otto, in Just. Mart. i. 206.

^e The date is fixed by most writers from A.D. 138 to 140; but by some as late as 150 or 151 (Semisch, Justin der Märtyrer, i. 64. 73, Bresl. 1840-2;

Clinton, A.D. 151). The chief objection to an early date is the mention of the heretic Marcion (c. 26), which Pagi (ii. 171) gets over by supposing that, when Justin wrote, Marcion had become notorious in the East, although he had not yet visited Rome.

^f Apol. i. 1; Kaye's Justin Martyr, 4-5; Semisch, i. 6-10.

desire to discover some solid foundation of belief than by any speculative turn of mind^g—he tried in succession the most popular forms of Greek philosophy; how in one after another he was disgusted, either by the defectiveness of the doctrine or by the character of the professor; how, soon after having embraced Platonism, he was walking on the seashore in deep meditation, when he was accosted by an old man of mild and reverend appearance, who told him that his studies were unpractical and useless, directed him to the Prophets and the New Testament, and exhorted him to pray “that the gates of light might be opened” to him.^h The convictions which arose from the course of reading thus suggested were strengthened by his observation of the constancy with which Christians endured persecution and death for the sake of their faith—a spectacle by which he had even before been convinced that the popular charges against their morals must be unfounded.ⁱ Justin became a Christian, and devoted himself to the defence and propagation of the Gospel. He travelled in Egypt, Asia, and elsewhere, retaining the garb of a philosopher, which invested him with an air of authority, and was serviceable in procuring a hearing for his doctrines;^k but his usual residence was at Rome, where he established a school of Christian philosophy.^m

Justin’s First Apology contains a bold remonstrance against the iniquity of persecuting Christians for their religion, while all other parties were allowed to believe and to worship according to their conscience. In this and in the other writings by which he maintained the cause of the Gospel against its various adversaries—heathens, Jews, and heretics—he refutes the usual calumnies, the charges of atheism and immorality,ⁿ of political disaffection and sedition.^o He appeals to the evidence of prophecy and miracles,^p

^g Neander, ii. 413.

^h Dial. c. Tryph. 2-7. Semisch, i. 10-15, supposes Ephesus to have been the scene of this. Archdeacon Evans prefers Cæsarea, i. 136.

ⁱ Apol. ii. 12.

^k Dial. c. Tryph. 1; Neander, i. 381-2.

^m Tillem. ii. 377. It is generally supposed that Justin did not enter into the ministry of the Church; Tillemont, however (ii. 350), is inclined to think that he was a priest, because in describing the administration of the Christian rites he uses the first person plural (Apol. i. 61). Neander would account for this by saying that “no such distinction was as yet made between clergy and laity as

would render it improbable that Justin expressed himself in this way on the principle of the universal Christian priesthood.” (ii. 413.) But surely Justin might speak in the first person plural of acts done by the body to which he belonged, without meaning either that he was himself an officiating person, or that every member of the congregation was alike entitled to officiate.

ⁿ Apol. i. 6, 9, 13.

^o Ibid. 11, 18.

^p Ibid. 30-53; Dial. c. Tryph. 56, seqq. The evidence from miracles, however, was little insisted on by the early Christian writers, since the belief in theurgic practices was so common

to the purity of the New Testament morality,^q to the lives of his brethren, their love even for their enemies, their disinterestedness, their firmness in confessing the faith, their patience in suffering for it.^r No one, he says, had ever believed Socrates in such a manner as to die for his philosophy; but multitudes, even in the lowest ranks, had braved danger and death in the cause of Christ.^s He dwells on the chief points of Christian doctrine, and elaborately discusses the resurrection of the body, an article which was especially difficult to the apprehension of the heathens.^t He vindicates the character and the miracles of our Lord; he rebuts the arguments drawn from the novelty of his religion, and from the depressed condition of its professors, which their enemies regarded as a disproof of their pretensions to the favour of the Almighty; he argues from the progress which the Gospel had already made, although unaided by earthly advantages.^u Nor is he content with defending his own creed; he attacks the corruptions and absurdities of Paganism, not only in its popular and poetical form, but as it appeared in the more refined interpretations of the philosophers;^x he exposes the foul abominations of heathen morals, and tells his opponents that the crimes which they slanderously imputed to the Christians might more truly be charged on themselves.^y

Justin often insists on the analogies which are to be found between the doctrines of Plato and those of Holy Scripture.^z He derives the wisdom of the Greeks from the Jews, through the medium of Egypt, and ascribes the corruptions of it to demons, who had laboured by such means to raise a prejudice against the reception of Christian doctrine.^a The good men of antiquity such as Socrates and Heraclitus, had been guided by a partial illumination of the Divine Logos, and, because they strove to live by this light, the demons had raised persecutions against them. Justin

among the heathen that the proof of a miracle would have done but little to establish the divine origin of a doctrine, unless some criteria were settled by which one kind of miracles might be distinguished from another. This is the true explanation of "the supine inattention of the pagan and philosophic world," from which Gibbon would conclude against the reality of the New Testament miracles (i. 525). Justin did something towards establishing a distinction. Semisch, ii. 197-201; Tzschirner, 270, 519-520. Comp. Bp. Kaye on Tertullian, 125-8.

^q Apol. i. 13.

^r Ibid. 13-6, 25.

^s Apol. ii. 10.

^t Apol. i. 19-20; Semisch, ii. 157. Of his special treatise on the Resurrection fragments only remain.

^u Apol. i. 39; Dial. c. Tr. 121; Semisch, ii. 120, 178.

^x Apol. i. 21, 25; Orat. ad Gentiles (a doubtful work); Coh. ad Gr. 3-7.

^y Ibid. 27-9; Apol. ii. 12.

^z Apol. i. 20, 59, 60; Apol. ii. 13; Coh. ad Gr. 26-31, &c.

^a Apol. i. 44-60; Dial. c. Tr. 69; Coh. ad Gr. 14, seqq.; Semisch, ii. 161.

therefore urges his heathen readers to embrace that wisdom which had been imperfectly vouchsafed to their sages, but was now offered in fulness to all men.^b While, however, he thus referred to heathen philosophy by way of illustration, and represented it as a preparation for Christianity, he was careful not to admit it as supplementary, or as an element of adulteration.^c

Although it is a mistake to suppose that the Apologies of the early writers were mere exercises, composed without any intention of presenting them to the emperors who are addressed,^d there is no evidence that Justin's First Apology produced any effect on Antoninus, or contributed to suggest his measures in favour of the Christians. The Roman political view of religion was, indeed, not to be disturbed by argument. All that the magistrate had to care for was a conformity to the established rites—a conformity which was considered to be a duty towards the state, but was not supposed to imply any inward conviction. The refusal of compliance by the Christians, therefore, was an unintelligible scruple, which statesmen could only regard, with Pliny, as a criminal obstinacy.^e

The elder Antoninus was succeeded in 161 by his adopted son Marcus Aurelius.^f Under this emperor—celebrated as he is for benevolence, justice, and intelligence—the state of the Christians was worse than in any former reign, except that of Nero; if, indeed, even this exception ought to be made, since Nero's persecution was probably limited to Rome.^g The gradual advance

^b Apol. ii. 7-12; Coh. ad Gr. 35.

^c Semisch, ii. 227-9. Another way of employing heathen authority consisted in references to the Sibylline prophecies, from their fondness for which Celsus gives some Christians the name of Sibyllists. (Orig. c. Cels. v. 61.) These writings, of unknown origin, had been interpolated from time to time before the Christian era. Christians had very early begun to practise on them in like manner, and to circulate other prophecies under the names of heathen sages, such as Hystaspes and Hermes Trismegistus. (Nat. Alex. iv. Dissert. 1; Mosh. 229-231; Gieseler, I. i. 227; Neander, i. 245-6; Tzschirner, 268-270; Mill on Pantheistic Principles, 367; Blunt on the Fathers, 60.) Tzschirner (196) thinks that in this they did not intend to deceive, but merely to present their doctrines in a form attractive to the heathens. There is no doubt that Justin's references to these books (e.g. Apol. i. 20, 44; Cohort. 16, 37) were

made in perfectly good faith. (Beveridge, Codex Canon. Vindic. 176, 192; Semisch, ii. 208.) Schröckh shows (ii. 400, seqq.) that the acceptance of such forgeries by the early Christian writers is no prejudice to the value of their evidence in favour of the books of Scripture.

^d This idea was started by Bayle (art. *Athenagoras*, notes B. C.); but is now generally regarded as a mistaken transference of modern notions to early times. See Schröckh, iii. 105; Tzschirner, 209.

^e Tertull. Apol. 27. "Le vieux polythéisme . . . était devenu une sorte d'hypocrisie publique, professée par l'état." Villemain, Tableau de l'Éloquence Chrétienne, 59. Comp. Neander, i. 243-4; Beugnot, i. 35.

^f It does not seem necessary in such a work as this to mention the colleagues who were associated with some of the emperors, unless in cases where the character of the colleague told on the religious policy of the reign.

^g Mosh. 246.

towards toleration, which had continued ever since the death of Domitian, is now succeeded by a sudden retrograde movement. The enmity against Christians is no longer peculiar to the populace; the local governors and judges are found to take an *active* part in persecution. Now, for the first time, they seek out the victims, in contravention of the principle laid down by Trajan; instead of discouraging informations, they invite or instigate them; they apply torture with the view of forcing a recantation; in order to obtain evidence, they violate the ancient law which forbade the admission of slaves as witnesses against their masters; they even wring out the evidence of slaves by torture.^h

In explanation of the contrast between the general character of Marcus and his policy towards the Church, it has been suggested that, in his devotion to philosophical studies, he may have neglected to bestow due care on the direction and superintendence of those by whom the government of the empire was administered; that he may have shared no further in the persecutions of his reign than by carelessly allowing them to be carried on.ⁱ This supposition, however, would seem to be inconsistent with facts; for, although no express law of this date against the Christians is extant, it is almost certain that the measures against them were sanctioned by new and severe edicts proceeding from the emperor himself;^k and we are not without the materials for a more satisfactory solution.

The reign was a period of great public disasters and calamities. A fearful pestilence ravaged the countries from Ethiopia to Gaul: the Tiber rose in flood, destroying among other buildings the public granaries, and causing a famine in the capital; the empire was harassed by long wars on the eastern and northern frontiers, and by the revolt of its most distinguished general in Syria. All such troubles were ascribed to the wrath of the gods, which the Christians were supposed to have provoked. The old tales of atheism and abominable practices, however often refuted, continued to keep their ground in the popular belief;^l and it appears on investigation that the fiercest renewals of persecution coincided in time with the chief calamities of the reign.^m The heathen, high

^h Tillem. ii. 310; Mosh. 244; Neander, i. 148-9; Gieseler, I. i. 175; Milman, ii. 160.

ⁱ Mosh. 244.

^k Tertullian says that he made no laws against them (Apol. 5); but see Pusey's notes; also Euseb. iv. 26; Baron. 164; Neander, i. 142-3; Tzschirner,

312; Milman, ii. 178. Neander (i. 149) ascribes to him an edict which bears the name of *Aurelian*; but Gieseler (I. i. 175) and Dean Milman oppose this view.

^l Mosh. 243.

^m This subject is very ably treated by Dean Milman, vol. ii. c. 7-

as well as low, were terrified into a feeling that the chastisements of Heaven demanded a revival of their sunken religion; they restored its neglected solemnities, they offered sacrifices of unusual costliness, they anxiously endeavoured to remove whatever might be supposed offensive to the gods.ⁿ

The emperor, as a sincerely religious heathen, shared in the general feeling; nor were his private opinions such as to dispose him favourably towards the Christians, whom it would appear that he knew only through the representations of their enemies the philosophers.^o The form of philosophy to which he was addicted—the Stoic—was very opposite in tone to the Gospel. It may be described as aristocratic—a system for the elevated few; it would naturally lead its followers to scorn as vulgar a doctrine which professed to be for all ranks of society, and for every class of minds.^p The firmness of the Stoic was to be the result of correct reasoning; the emperor himself, in his “Meditations,” illustrates the true philosophical calmness by saying that it must not be like the demeanour of the Christians in death, which he regards as enthusiastic and theatrical.^q And the enthusiasm was infectious; the sect extended throughout, and even beyond, the empire; already its advocates began to boast of the wonderful progress of their doctrines;^r and the circumstances thus alleged in its favour might suggest a fear of dangerous combinations and movements to the mind of an unfriendly statesman. If, too, the prosperity of a nation depended on its gods, the triumph over paganism which the Christians anticipated must, it was thought, imply the ruin of the empire. A “kingdom not of this world” was an idea which the heathen could not understand; nor was their alarm without countenance from the language of many Christians,^s for not only was the Apocalypse interpreted as foretelling the downfall of pagan Rome, but pretended prophecies, such as the Sibylline verses, spoke of it openly, and in a tone of exultation.^t

ⁿ Baron. 164. 6; Neander, i. 145.

^o Tillem. ii. 307; Emp. ii. 372; Mosh. 241-5; Neander, i. 146-7.

^p Schröckh, iii. 80; Villemain, *Tabl. de l'Éloq. Chrét.* The truth of this description is not affected by the difference which M. Villemain well points out between the harshness of Stoicism in its earlier days and the humaner form which it wore in Marcus Aurelius—the result, perhaps, of an unsuspected influence of the Gospel (p. 66).

^q L. xi. c. 3. The genuineness of the words *ὡς οἱ Χριστιανοὶ* has been ques-

tioned, but seemingly without ground. See Gieseler, I. ii. 170. Archdeacon Evans points out that the “Meditations” are pervaded by a special regard to social duties, and that the Christians, as they avoided many of the usual occupations and amusements of life, must have appeared to the emperor to be wanting in this respect (i. 151).

^r See Just. Dial. c. Tryph. 117, quoted below, ch. viii. sect. 1.

^s Just. Apol. i. 11.

^t Tzschirner, 192-4, 199, 234, 310-311; Beugnot, i. 21; Milm. ii. 164-172;

It was long believed that Marcus, in the latter years of his reign, changed his policy towards the Christians, in consequence of a miraculous deliverance which he had experienced in one of his campaigns against the Quadi. His army was hemmed
A.D. 174. in by the barbarians; the soldiers were exhausted by wounds and fatigue, and parched by the rays of a burning sun. In this distress (it is said) a legion composed of Christians stepped forward and knelt down in prayer; on which the sky was suddenly overspread with clouds, and a copious shower descended for the refreshment of the Romans, who took off their helmets to catch the rain. While they were thus partly unarmed, and intent only on quenching their thirst, the enemy attacked them; but a violent storm of lightning and hail arose, which drove full against the barbarians, and enabled the imperial forces to gain an easy victory. It is added that the interposition of the God of Christians was acknowledged; that the emperor bestowed the name of *Fulminatrix* on the legion whose prayers had been so effectual; and that he issued an edict in favour of their religion.^u

In refutation of this story it has been shown that, while the deliverance is attested by heathen as well as Christian writers, by coins, and by a representation on the Antonine column,^v it is ascribed by the heathens to Jupiter or Mercury, and is said to have been procured either by the arts of an Egyptian magician or by the prayers of the emperor himself;^x that the idea of a legion consisting of Christians is absurd; that the title of *Fulminatrix* was as old as the time of Augustus; and that the worst persecutions of the reign were later than the date of the supposed edict of toleration. But, although the miracle of "The Thundering Legion" is now generally abandoned,^y the story may have arisen without any intentional fraud. The deliverance of the army in the Quadian war is certain; we may safely assume that the Christian soldiers prayed in their distress, and that they rightly ascribed the relief to the mercy of God. We have then only to suppose, further, that some Christian, ignorant of military antiquities, connected this event with the name of the *Legio Fulminatrix*; and the other circumstances are

Lat. Christ. i. 37. Moreover, the Christian writers did not always preserve a proper tone of respect towards the emperor. Thus Tatian spoke of him as paying large salaries to philosophers, "that they might not wear their beards long for nothing." Orat. adv. Græcos, c. 19 (in the Benedictine edition of Justin).

405-7.

^v See the engraving in Baron. ii. 292.

^x Jul. Capitolin. Vit. M. Aurel. c. 24.

^y Guericke, indeed, endeavours to uphold it (i. 130); but an explanation similar to that in the text is given even by Dr. Newman (Essay on Ecl. Miracles, cxxi.-ii.), and by Rohrbacher, v. 159-161.

^u Euseb. v. 5; Tillem. Emp. ii.

such as might have easily been added to the tale in the course of its transmission.^z

The most eminent persons who suffered death under Marcus Aurelius were Justin and Polycarp. Early in the reign Justin was induced, by the martyrdom of some Christians at Rome, to compose a Second Apology, in which he expressed an expectation that he himself might soon fall a victim to the arts of his enemies, and especially of one Crescens, a Cynic, who is described as a very vile member of his unlovely sect.^a The apprehension was speedily verified; and Justin, after having borne himself in his examination with firmness and dignity, was beheaded at Rome, and earned the glorious title which usually accompanies his name.

The martyrdom of Justin was followed^b by that of Polycarp—a man whose connexion with the Apostolic age invested him with an altogether peculiar title to reverence in the time to which he had survived. He had been a disciple of St. John, who is supposed to have placed him in the see of Smyrna.^c It was perhaps Polycarp who was addressed as the “angel” of that church in the Apocalypse;^d and we have already noticed his correspondence with the martyr Ignatius.

Towards the end of the reign of Pius, Polycarp had visited Rome^e—partly, although not exclusively, for the purpose of discussing a question as to the time of keeping Easter. It had been the practice of the Asiatic Churches to celebrate the Paschal supper on the fourteenth day of the first Jewish month—the same day on which the Jews ate the passover; and three days later, without regard to the day of the week, they kept the feast of the Resurrection. Other Churches, on the contrary, held it unlawful to interrupt the fast of the Holy Week, or to celebrate the Resurrection on any other day than the first; their Easter, consequently, was always on a Sunday, and their Paschal supper was on its eve.

^a See Pagi, ii. 286; Mosh. 249-251; Schröckh, iii. 148-9; Routh, Reliqq. Sacre, i. 165-7; Kaye on Tertullian, 99; Burton, ii. 166-8; Neander, i. 159-162; Gieseler, I. i. 176; Pusey, n. on Tertull. i. 14; Clinton, ii. 23, seqq.; Blunt, 294-6.

^b C. 3; Tatian. adv. Gr. c. 19. Bishop Pearson supposes that the Second Apology was addressed to Antoninus Pius, and that Justin was put to death in 150 (Min. Works, ii. 502). But the Apology is usually placed in this reign, and the martyrdom about 166. (Semisch, 147-

53; Gieseler, I. i. 205.) For the acts of the martyrdom see Otto, ii. 262, seqq.

^c Some place the death of Polycarp first. Baronius and Mosheim date it in 169; Pearson (Min. Works, ii. 531) in 147; Pagi (although not confidently) in 158 (ii. 236); Clinton in 166; others in 167.

^d Iren. III. iii. 4.

^e ii. 8-11. See Schaff, i. 433.

^f About A.D. 158, Burton (ii. 124); 159, Baron.; 160, Schröckh. See Augusti, ii. 24.

The Asiatic or *Quartodeciman* practice was traced to St. John and St. Philip; that of other Churches to St. Peter and St. Paul.^f

Polycarp was received at Rome by the bishop, Anicetus, with the respect due to his personal character, to his near connexion with the Apostles, to his advanced age, and to his long tenure of the episcopal office—for Anicetus was the seventh bishop of Rome since his guest had been set over the church of Smyrna. The discussion of the Paschal question was carried on with moderation; it was agreed that on such a matter a difference of practice might be allowed; and Anicetus, in token of fellowship and regard, allowed the Asiatic bishop to consecrate the Eucharist in his presence.^g During his residence at Rome, Polycarp succeeded in recovering many persons who had been perverted to heresy by Valentinus, Marcion, and Marcellina, a female professor of Gnosticism.^h It is said, also, that he had a personal encounter with Marcion, and that when the heresiarch (probably with reference to some former acquaintance in Asia) asked him for a sign of recognition, his answer was, "I know thee for the firstborn of Satan."ⁱ

The martyrdom of Polycarp is related in a letter composed in the name of his Church.^k Persecution had begun to rage in Asia; many of the Smyrnæan Christians had suffered with admirable constancy; one, however, who had at first been forward in exposing himself, had been persuaded to sacrifice, and from his case the writers of the letter take occasion to discourage the practice of voluntarily courting persecution. The multitude was enraged at the sight of the fortitude which the martyrs displayed, and a cry arose, "Away with the Atheists! Seek out Polycarp!" The behaviour of the venerable bishop, when thus demanded as a victim, was worthy of his character for Christian prudence and sincerity. At the persuasion of his friends he withdrew to a village, from which he afterwards removed to another; and, on being discovered in his second retreat, he calmly said, "The will of God be done!" He ordered food to be set before his captors, and spent in fervent

^f This is Mosheim's account of the difference (435, seqq.); but there still remains a question on the subject. Comp. Schröckh, iii. 53-4; Routh, Rel. Sac. ii. 17-20; Augusti, ii. 25; Neander, i. 412-3; Gieseler, I. ii. 240-2; Jacobson, PP. Apostol. lii.

^g Παρεχώρησεν ὁ Ἀνίκητος τὴν εὐχαριστίαν τῷ Πολυκάρπῳ (Iren. ap. Euseb. v. 24). Some, with whom Heinichen (not. in loc.) agrees, understand that Anicetus

gave the Eucharist to Polycarp; but, as Stieren remarks (n. in Iren. t. i. 827), this would not have been any mark of distinguished honour, which is the character in which Irenæus evidently means to represent the act. See the Apost. Constitutions, ii. 58.

^h Iren. I. xxv. 6.

ⁱ Ibid. III. iii. 4.

^k Published in the collections of the Apostolical Fathers.

prayer the time which was allowed him before he was carried off to the city. As he entered the arena, he is said to have heard a voice from heaven—"Be strong, Polycarp, and play the man!" and it is added that many of his brethren also heard it. His appearance greatly excited the spectators, who broke out into loud clamours. The proconsul exhorted him to purchase liberty by renouncing his faith; but he replied, "Fourscore and six years¹ have I served Christ, and He hath done me no wrong; how can I now blaspheme my King and Saviour?" It was in vain that the proconsul renewed his solicitations, and threatened him with the beasts and with fire. The multitude cried out for the bishop's death, and he was condemned to be burnt—a sentence of which he is said to have before received an intimation by a vision of a fiery pillow. A quantity of wood was soon collected—the Jews, "as was their custom," being especially zealous in the work. In compliance with his own request, that he might not be fastened with the usual iron cramps, as he trusted that God would enable him to endure the flames without flinching, Polycarp was tied to the stake with cords, and in that position he uttered a thanksgiving for the privilege of glorifying God by his death. The pile was then kindled, but, instead of touching him, the flame swept around him "like the sail of a ship filled with wind," while his body appeared in the midst, "not like flesh that is burnt, but like bread that is baked, or like gold and silver glowing in a furnace;" and a perfume as of frankincense or spices filled the air.^m As the fire seemingly refused to do its office, one of the executioners stabbed the martyr with a sword, whereupon there issued forth a profusion of blood sufficient to quench the flames.ⁿ The heathens and the Jews then burnt the body—out of fear, as they said, lest the Christians should worship Polycarp instead of "the Crucified,"—an apprehension by which, as the Church of Smyrna remarks, they showed an utter ignorance of Christian doctrine. The brethren were therefore obliged to content themselves with collecting some of the bones, and bestowing

¹ Some understand this to mean his age; others the period since his conversion. See Jacobson, 564-5.

^m This has been accounted for by supposing that the hastily-gathered pile was partly composed of aromatic wood. (Milman, ii. 88.) It seems best in general to leave without comment those parts of the story in which the feelings of the narrators may have given it a miraculous character.

ⁿ The Martyrdom in the common copies (c. 16) reads, ἐξῆλθε περιστέρα καὶ

πλῆθος αἵματος, "there came out a dove and a large quantity of blood." The words περιστέρα καὶ are wanting in Eusebius and in some MSS. Various conjectures have been proposed in order to get rid of or explain the *dove*. Some would read περὶ στήνᾱ, "there came forth about the breast," or ἐκ ἀριστερά, "on the left." See Jacobson, in loc. Dr. Wordsworth ("St. Hippolytus," 319) offers a very ingenious reading, περὶ στήνακα, "about the haft." See too Evans, i. 90.

on them an honourable burial. As in the case of Ignatius, the death of the bishop procured a respite for his flock.

At a later time in the reign of Marcus Aurelius a violent persecution took place in the south of Gaul.^o The Church of Lyons and Vienne was of eastern, and comparatively recent, origin;^p it was still under the care of Pothinus, the head of the mission by which the Gospel had been introduced. In the year 177,^q when the empire was alarmed by renewed apprehensions of the German war, the Christians of these cities found themselves the objects of outrage; they were insulted and attacked in the streets, their houses were entered and plundered. The eagerness of the authorities to second the popular feeling on this occasion appears in striking contrast with the practice of earlier times. Orders were given to search out the Christians; by the illegal application of torture some heathen slaves were brought to charge their masters with the abominations of Œdipus and Thyestes; and the victims were then tortured in various ways, and were imprisoned in dungeons where noisomeness and privation were fatal to many. The bishop, a man upwards of ninety years old, and infirm both from age and from sickness, was dragged before the governor, who asked him, "Who is the God of Christians?" "If thou art worthy," answered Pothinus, "thou shalt know." He was scourged by the officers, and was beaten, kicked, and pelted by the crowd; after which he was carried almost lifeless to a prison, where he died within two days. A distinction was made as to the manner of death between persons of different conditions; slaves were crucified, provincials were exposed to beasts, and the emperor, on being consulted as to the manner of dealing with those who claimed the privilege of Roman citizenship, ordered that such of them as adhered to their faith should be beheaded. Yet, notwithstanding this, an Asiatic named Attalus, although a citizen of Rome, was tortured and was exposed to beasts. When placed in a heated iron chair, he calmly remarked, as the smell of his burning flesh arose, that his persecutors were guilty of the cannibalism which they falsely imputed to the Christians.

The behaviour of the sufferers was throughout marked by composure and sobriety. They succeeded by their prayers and by their arguments in persuading some of their brethren, who had at first yielded to the fear of death, to confess their Lord, and to give

^o The authority for this is a letter of the Church of Lyons and Vienne, preserved by Eusebius, l. v. (although in-

complete).

^p Mosh. 207, 211.

^q Tillem. iii. v.; Milman, ii. 194.

themselves for him. A slave, named Blandina, was distinguished above all the other martyrs for the variety of tortures which she endured. Her mistress, a Christian, had feared that the faith of a slave might give way in time of trial; but Blandina's character had been formed, not by her condition, but by the faith which she professed. Her constancy wearied out the inventive cruelty of her tormentors, and amidst her greatest agonies she found strength and relief in repeating, "I am a Christian, and no wickedness is done among us."^r

The malice of the heathen did not end with the death of their victims. They cast their bodies to the dogs; they burnt such fragments as were left uneaten, and threw the ashes into the Rhone, in mockery of the doctrine of a resurrection.

In this reign began the controversial opposition on the side of Paganism. The leader in it, Celsus, a person of a showy but shallow cleverness, who is generally supposed to have been an Epicurean, although in his attack he affected the character of a Platonist,^s reflected on Christianity for its "barbarous" origin,^t and charged it with having borrowed from the Egyptians, from Plato, and from other heathen sources.^u He assailed the Scriptural narrative—sometimes confounding Christianity with Judaism,^x at another time labouring to prove the Old Testament inconsistent with the New,^y at another introducing a Jew as the mouthpiece for his objections against the Gospel.^z The lowness of the Saviour's earthly birth, the poverty of the first disciples, the humble station, the simplicity, the credulity, of Christians in his own day, furnished Celsus with ample matter for merriment, which was sometimes of a very ribald character.^a He ascribed the miracles of Scripture to magic,^b and taxed the Christians with addiction to practices of the same kind.^c He censured both the doctrines and the morality of the Gospel. Utterly futile and worthless as the work of Celsus appears to have been, it continued for a century to be regarded as the chief of those written against Christianity. It was at length

^r Comp. Iren. Fragm. ap. Stieren, i. 832.

^s Origen throughout treats him as a disguised Epicurean (*e.g.* i. 8; iv. 4, 54). See Mosh. 256; Gieseler, I. i. 161; Neander, i. 222, seqq.; Tzschirner, 325–7; Semisch, i. 41. By some Celsus is placed in the reign of Hadrian. Mosheim, in his preface to a translation of Origen's work against him, conjectures that he was a Neoplatonist, of the school

of Ammonius; but this supposition, which would place him much later, is improbable. (Schröckh, iv. 94.) Redepenning calls him an eclectic Platonist. (Origenes, ii. 131–4.)

^t Orig. c. Cels. i. 2.

^u Ibid. 22; vi. 7, &c.

^x i. 26. ^y L. vii.

^z L. ii. See Blunt, 123.

^a *e.g.* i. 7, 27–32, 39; ii. 47, &c.

^b i. 38. ^c i. 6.

honoured with a full and elaborate exposure by Origen;^d but in the mean time the Gospel did not want able advocates, both in the form of apologies and of other treatises. Among the apologists were Melito bishop of Sardis; Theophilus bishop of Antioch; Athenagoras, an Athenian philosopher, who is said to have been converted by a perusal of the Scriptures, which he had undertaken with the view of refuting Christianity;^e Claudius Apollinaris bishop of Hierapolis; Miltiades; and Tatian, a pupil of Justin Martyr.^f Tatian afterwards gained a more unhappy celebrity as the founder of the sect of Encratites.^g His tenets, and those of his contemporary Bardesanes of Edessa—whose hymns found their way even into the congregations of the orthodox—need not be further described than by saying that they both belonged to the Gnostic family.^h A sect of a different character—that of Montanus—had also its rise in the reign of Marcus; but a notice of it may be more fitly given at a somewhat later date, and we must now turn back to survey the heresies which had already disturbed the Church.

^d His treatise "Against Celsus" is in ii. 39.
eight books.

^e Schröckh, iii. 119. See Tzschirner, 212-5. Philip of Side, a writer of the fifth century (for whom see below, b. ii. c. 9), very improbably makes him head of the catechetical school of Alexandria. See Pref. to the Bened. edition of Just. Martyr. (Par. 1742), p. cxi.

^f Minucius Felix is also referred to this period by some writers, as Tzschirner, 219. See Gieseler, I. i. 208; Bähr,

^g Iren. I. xxviii. 1; Epiphan. Hær. 116-7.

^h For Bardesanes see Epiph. Hær. 56. His son Harmonius was also celebrated as a hymnographer. St. Ephrem, in the fourth century, expelled the hymns of Harmonius from the Church, by substituting orthodox compositions of the same measures. Sozomen, iii. 16; Augusti, v. 352.

CHAPTER IV.

THE EARLY HERETICS.

HEGESIPPUS^a and Clement of Alexandria^b have been derided as having stated that the Church was not polluted by schism or heresy until the reign of Trajan, or that of Hadrian; and it is added, "We may observe, with much more propriety, that during [the earlier] period the disciples of the Messiah were indulged in a freer latitude, both of faith and practice, than has ever been allowed in succeeding ages."^c In reality, however, the fathers make no such assertion as is here supposed; their words relate, not to the appearance of the first symptoms of error, but to the distinct formation of bodies which, while they claimed the Christian name, yet held doctrines different from those of the Church.^d Nor has the remark which is offered by way of correction any other truth than this,—that the measures of the Church for the protection of her members against erroneous teaching were taken only as the development of evil made them necessary. The New Testament itself bears ample witness both to the existence of false doctrine during the lifetime of the Apostles, and to the earnestness with which they endeavoured to counteract it. Among the persons who are there censured by name, some appear to be taxed with faults of conduct only; but of others the opinions are condemned. Thus it is said of Hymenæus that he has "made shipwreck concerning the faith;" that he has "erred concerning the truth, saying that the resurrection is past already;" and Alexander and Philetus are included in the same charges.^e In St. Paul's Epistles, besides the passages which bear a controversial character on their surface, there are many in which a comparison with the language of early heresy will lead us to discern such a character.^f The same may be observed of other apostolical writings; those of St. John especially are throughout marked by a reference to prevailing errors, and to the terminology in which these were conveyed. And long before the probable date

^a Ap. Euseb. iii. 32.

^b Strom. vii. 17, p. 898.

^c Gibbon, i. 465.

^d Heinichen in Euseb. iii. 32 (t. i. 266).

^e 1 Tim. i. 19–20; 2 Tim. ii. 17–18.

^f See Burton, Bampton Lectures, III.–IV.; Matter, Hist. du Gnosticisme, t. i.

of any Christian Scripture, we meet with him who has always been regarded as the father of heresy—the magician Simon of Samaria.^g

In reading of the ancient heretics we must remember that the accounts of them come from their enemies; and our own experience will show us how easily misunderstanding or misrepresentation of an opponent may creep in even where there is no unfair intention. We must not be too ready to believe evil;^h we must beware of confounding the opinions of heresiarchs with those of their followers; and especially we must beware of too easily supposing that the founders of sects were unprincipled or profligate men, since by so doing we should not only, in many cases, be wrong as to the fact, but should forego an important lesson. The “fruits” by which “false prophets” shall be knownⁱ are not to be sought in their own personal conduct (which may be inconsistent, either for the worse or for the better, with their teaching), but in the results which follow from their principles,—in their developed doctrines and maxims, and in those of their disciples.

But, on the other hand, if the ancients, and those who have implicitly followed them in treating such subjects, must be read with caution, it is no less necessary to be on our guard against the theories and statements of some moderns, who are ready to sympathize with every reputed heretic, to represent him as only too far elevated by genius and piety above the Church of his own day, and conjecturally to fill up the gaps of his system, to explain away its absurdities, and to harmonise its contradictions. A writer who endeavours to enter into the mind of a heresiarch, and to trace the course of his ideas, is, indeed, more likely to help us towards an understanding of the matter than one who sets out with the presumption that the man’s deliberate purpose was to vent detestable blasphemies, and to ruin the souls of his followers; and we may often draw instruction or warning from Beausobre or Neander, where Epiphanius or Baronius would only tempt us to question whether the opinions imputed to heretical parties could ever have been really held by any one. Yet we must not assume that things cannot have been because the idea of them appears monstrous; we must remember that even the most ingenious conjecture may be mistaken; and, if the conclusions of a system as to faith or morals

^g Acts viii. See Bull, v. 505.

^h Evagrius (from whom such remarks might hardly have been expected), in pointing out the distinction between heathen and Christian varieties of opinion, vindicates the heretics from

the charge of *intentional* impiety; each, he says, only thought to be more correct than all before him, i. 11.

ⁱ St. Matth. vii. 15–6. See Tholuck in loc.

are abominable, we may not speak of such a system with admiration or indulgence on account of any poetical beauty or philosophical depth which may appear to be mixed up with its errors.

The systems of the earliest heretical teachers were for the most part of the class called *Gnostic*,^k—a name which implies pretensions to more than ordinary knowledge. It is disputed whether St. Paul intended to refer to this sense of the word in his warning against “knowledge falsely so called;”¹ but although it seems most likely that the peculiar use of the term did not begin until later, the thing itself certainly existed in the Apostle’s days. The Gnostics were for the most part so remote in their tenets from the Christian creed that they would now be classed rather with utter aliens from the Gospel than with heretics; but in early times the title of *heretic* was given to all who in any way whatever introduced the name of Christ into their systems, so that, as has been remarked, “if Mahomet had appeared in the second century, Justin Martyr or Irenæus would have spoken of him as an heretic.”^m

On looking at the strange opinions which are thus brought before us, we may wonder how they could ever have been adopted by any to whom the Christian faith had been made known. But a consideration of the circumstances will lessen our surprise; Gnosticism is in truth not to be regarded as a corruption of Christianity, but as an adoption of some Christian elements into a system of different origin.

At the time when the Gospel appeared, a remarkable mixture had taken place in the existing systems of religion and philosophy. The Jews had during their captivity become acquainted with the Chaldæan and Persian doctrines: many of them had remained in the East, and a constant communication was kept up between the descendants of these and their brethren of the Holy Land. Thus the belief of the later Jews had been much tinged with oriental ideas, especially in relation to angels and spiritual beings. The prevailing form of Greek philosophy—the Platonic—had, from the first, contained elements of Eastern origin; and in later days the intercourse of nations had led to a large adoption of foreign additions. The great city of Alexandria, in particular, which was afterwards to be the cradle of Gnosticism, became a centre of

^k This name, however, was not assumed in common by the sects, but was applied to them. The Carpocratians—the worst and most immoral sect of all—or a party among these, are said to have been the only Gnostics who styled themselves so. Iren. I. xxv. 6; Matter, i.

316.

¹ 1 Tim. vi. 20; where the word *ἀντιθέσεις* (*oppositions*) has been referred to the Gnostic doctrine of opposition between the kingdoms of light and darkness. Matter, i. 207–8.

^m Burton, Bampton Lect. 12.

philosophical speculations. In its schools were represented the doctrines of Egypt, of Greece, of Palestine, and indirectly those of Persia and Chaldæa—themselves affected by the systems of India and the further East.ⁿ The prevailing tone of mind was eclectic; all religions were regarded as having in them something divine, while no one was supposed to possess a full and sufficient revelation.^o Hence, ideas were borrowed from one to fill up the deficiencies of another. Hence, systems became so intermingled and were so modified by each other, that learned men have differed as to the origin of Gnosticism—some referring it chiefly to Platonism,^p while others trace it to Oriental sources.^q Hence, too, we can understand how Christianity came to be combined with notions so strangely unlike itself. The same eclectic principle which had produced the fusion of other systems, led speculative minds to adopt something from the Gospel; they took only so much as was suitable for their purpose, and they interpreted this at will. The substance of each system is Platonic, or Oriental, or derived from the later Judaism; the Scriptural terms which are introduced are used in senses altogether different from that which they bear in Christian theology.

The especial characteristic of the Gnostics was (as has been stated) a pretension to superior knowledge.^r By this the more elevated spirits were to be distinguished from the vulgar, for whom faith and traditional opinion were said to be sufficient; the Gnostics sometimes complained of it as an injustice that they were excluded from the communion of the Church, whereas they were willing to leave the multitude in possession of the common creed, and only claimed for themselves the privilege of understanding doctrine in an inner and a more refined sense.^s On such a principle the Old Testament had been interpreted by Philo of Alexandria, the type of a Platonizing Jew;^t and now the principle was applied to the New Testament, from which texts were produced by way of sanction for it.^u As for the older Scriptures, the Gnostics either rejected them altogether, or perverted them by an unlimited license of allegorical explanation.

ⁿ Matter, i. 127. On the likenesses between Gnosticism and Indian systems see Lassen, *Indische Alterthumskunde*, iii. 380–405.

^o Ibid. 45.

^p Ibid. 72; Burton, *Bampt. Lect.*, note 7. This is the view of the early Fathers. See Kaye's *Tertullian*, 449.

^q Mosheim, *Inst. Maj.* 341; Brucker, ii. 643.

^r Both Pythagoras and Plato had used

the word *γνώσις* to signify the *highest* knowledge; and the distinction of grades is common to eastern religions. Matter, i. 51; Brucker, ii. 642.

^s Iren. iii. 15.

^t Matter, i. 60. The principle of the Cabala is the same. Burton, *Bampt. Lect.* 303.

^u Such as 1 Cor. ii. 6. See Matter, vol. i.

We find, as common to all the Gnostic systems, a belief in one Supreme God, dwelling from eternity in the *Pleroma*, or fulness of light. From him proceed forth successive generations of spiritual beings, the chief of which are shown by their names to be impersonated attributes of the Deity;^x and in proportion as these emanations are more remote from the primal source, the likeness of his perfections in them becomes continually fainter.^y Matter is regarded as eternal, and as essentially evil. Out of it the world was formed, not by the Supreme God, but by the *Demiurge*—a being who is represented by some heresiarchs as merely a subordinate and unconscious instrument of the divine will, but by others as positively malignant, and hostile to the Supreme. This *Demiurge* (or creator) was the national God of the Jews—the God of the Old Testament; according, therefore, as *he* is viewed in each system, the Mosaic economy is either recognised as preparatory or rejected as evil.^z Christ was sent into the world to deliver man from the tyranny of the *Demiurge*. But the Christ of Gnosticism was neither very God nor very man; his spiritual nature, as being an emanation from the Supreme God, was necessarily inferior to its original; and, on the other hand, an emanation from God could not dwell in a material, and consequently evil, body. Either, therefore, Jesus was a mere man, on whom the *Æon* Christ de-

* This is an oriental feature. To these emanations Valentinus gave the name of *cons* (*αἰῶνες*), which, for the sake of convenience, may be also used in describing systems earlier than his. “‘Comme le temps,’ dit Damascene [De Fid. Orthod. ii. 1] ‘est la durée des êtres fragiles et passagers, *aion* est celle des êtres éternels.’ C’est là, si je ne me trompe, ce qui a donné occasion d’appeler *aïones* les substances immortelles. . . . Clément d’Alexandrie a dit qu’ ‘*aion* représente à la fois, et réunit comme en un seul instant, toutes les parties du temps, le passé, le présent, et l’avenir.’ [Strom. i. 13.] Cela veut dire, que ce terme présente à l’esprit l’idée d’un être qui a existé, qui existe, et qui existera toujours.” (Beausobre, Hist. de Manichée, i. 570.) Theodoret censures the use of the word to denote living beings, whereas it properly means duration, whether finite or infinite. (Hær. v. 6.) Gieseler (I. i. 188) defines it, in its Gnostic application, as meaning “developments of the Divine essence, which, as being such, are raised above the limitations of time.”

^y Burton, B. L. 36–7; Matter, i. 17.

^z The opposition to the *Demiurge* was in some cases carried to an almost

incredible length, so as to reverse the characters of Scripture history. Among the Ophites (from *ὄφις*, a serpent)—a sect which began in the second century, and lasted even into the sixth (Gieseler, I. i. 190)—there were some who supposed the serpent of Genesis iii. to have been either the Divine Wisdom or the Christ himself—come in order to set men free from the ignorance in which the *Demiurge* (*Jaldabaoth*, Son of Darkness or Chaos) wished to enthrall them. (Iren. i. 30; Epiph. Hær. 37.) The Cainites, another sect of the same kind, ran into perhaps a yet wilder extravagance. They held that the books of both the Old and the New Testament were the work of writers who had been inspired by the *Demiurge* to give a false colouring to the story; that the real worthies were those who are reprobated in Scripture—such as Cain, Esau, the men of Sodom, Korah, &c.; that the only spiritual apostle was Judas Iscariot, who betrayed his Master because he knew that the consequence would be to deliver man from the *Demiurge*, and had left a gospel of his own, which the Cainites supposed themselves to possess! Iren. I. xxxi. 1; Epiph. xxxviii.

scended at his baptism, to forsake him again before his crucifixion; or the body with which Christ seemed to be clothed was a phantom, and all his actions were only in appearance.^a

Since matter was evil, the Gnostic was required to overcome it; but here arose an important practical difference; for while some among the sectaries sought the victory by a high ascetic abstraction from the things of sense, the baser kind professed to show their knowledge by wallowing in impurity and excess.^b The same view as to the evil nature of matter led to a denial of the resurrection of the body. The Gnostic could admit no other than a spiritual resurrection; the object of his philosophy was to emancipate the spirit from its gross and material prison; at death, the soul of the perfect Gnostic, having already risen in baptism, was to be gathered into the bosom of God, while such souls as yet lacked their full perfection were to work it out in a course of transmigrations.^c The contest of good with evil (it was taught) is to end in the victory of good. Every spark of life which originally came from God will be purified and restored, will return to its source, and will dwell with Him for ever in the Pleroma.

After this general sketch of the Gnostic doctrines, we may proceed to notice in detail a few of the most prominent of the early heretical systems.^d

I. First among the precursors of Gnosticism stands Simon, usually styled Magus or the Sorcerer, a native of the Samaritan village of Gittum.^e He is supposed to have studied at Alexandria,^f and, on returning to his native country, he advanced high spiritual pretensions, "giving out that himself was some great one," and being generally acknowledged by the Samaritans as "the great power of God."^g Simon belonged to a class of adventurers not uncommon in his day, who addressed themselves especially to that

^a The latter view was called *Docetism* (from *δοκῆαι*, to seem). A distinct sect of Docetes arose in the middle of the second century (Matter, iii. 30); but the term is generally used to denote the *opinion*, as held in common by various sects.

^b Ibid. 138; Neander, ii. 26. The Carpocratians held that it was a duty to "go through all sorts of actions." (Iren. I. xxv. 4.) Against both the asceticism and the sensuality of Gnostics see Clem. Alex. Strom. i. iii.

^c Burton, Bampton Lect. 130-1, 423-7.

^d The only practicable classification of the Gnostics appears to be the geographical. Matter divides them into

Syrian, Alexandrian, and Asiatic, and criticises the attempts of Neander and others to arrange them according to their tenets (i. 320-3; comp. Hagenbach, i. 46). It is found, however, that, according to the place of their origin, the various sects gave greater prominence to particular doctrines; thus, the Alexandrian Gnosis had more of Platonism, and the Syrian of Parsism; the Alexandrian, of the emanative principle, the Syrian, of dualism. Gieseler, I. i. 184.

^e Just. Mart. Apol. i. 26.

^f Walch, i. 142-4; Kaye's Justin Martyr, 126.

^g Acts viii. 9-10.

desire of intercourse with a higher world which was then widely felt. The doctrines of these professors were a medley of Jewish, Greek, and Oriental notions; they affected mysteries and revelations; they practised the acts of conjuration and divination. It would seem that not only in the class as a whole, but in many of its individual members, there was a mixture of conscious imposture with self-delusion and superstitious credulity.^h Simon's reception of baptism, and his attempt to buy the privilege of conferring the Holy Ghost, may be interpreted as tokens of a belief that the Apostles, through a knowledge of higher secrets or a connexion with superior intelligences, possessed in a greater degree the same theurgic power to which he himself pretended.ⁱ The feeling of awe with which he was struck by St. Peter's reproof would seem to have been of very short continuance.^k

It is said that he afterwards roved through various countries, choosing especially those which the Gospel had not yet reached, and endeavouring to preoccupy the ground by his own system, in which the name of Christ was now introduced; that he bought at Tyre a beautiful prostitute, named Helena, who became the companion of his wanderings;^l that in the reign of Claudius he went to Rome, where he acquired great celebrity, and was honoured with a statue in the island of the Tiber;^m that he there disputed with St. Peter and St. Paul (a circumstance which, if true, must be referred to a later visit, in the reign of Nero); that he attempted to fly in the air, and was borne up by his familiar demons, until at the prayer of St. Peter he fell to the earth; and that he died soon after, partly of the bodily hurt which he had received, and partly

^h See Neander, i. 41; Schaff, i. 218-9.

ⁱ Matter, i. 259; Milman, ii. 96.

^k Neander, Pflanzung u. Leitung, 107.

^l Iren. I. xxiii. 2.

^m The first authority for this is Justin Martyr, who states (Apol. i. 26, 56) that the statue bore the inscription, *Simoni Deo Sancto*. In 1574 a fragment, with an inscription beginning *Semoni Sancto Deo*, was discovered in the very place described; and it has since been generally supposed that Justin—being imperfectly acquainted with Latin, knowing little of the Roman mythology, and having his mind preoccupied by the thought of Simon Magus—confounded him with Semo Sancus, a Sabine deity. Tillemont (ii. 481), Reeves (Transl. of Apologies, i. 50, ed. 1716), Burton (B. L. n. 42), Guericke (i. 250), and others, however, maintain the correctness of the story; as does also Dr. Pusey,

although less positively (n. on Tertulian, i. 32). A remembrance of the extraordinary sights which foreigners of undoubted veracity and intelligence profess to have seen in our own country may dispose us to set aside, with very little scruple, such arguments as are founded on the character of St. Justin. In like manner the mistakes of Anglo-American travellers in England may tell against the authority of the African-Latin fathers who repeat Justin's statement. Baron Bunsen notes it as significant, that the author of the newly-discovered '*Philosophumena*' (who, as one of the Roman clergy, must have had the best means of information), although he follows St. Irenæus in his account of Simon, omits all notice of the statue, as to which Irenæus had copied Justin. '*Christianity and Mankind*,' i. 354.

of vexation at his discomfiture.ⁿ Fabulous as parts of this story evidently are, it is yet possible that they may have had some foundation. There is no apparent reason for denying that Simon may have visited Rome, and may there have had contests with the two great Apostles; and even the story of his flying may have arisen from an attempt which was really made by a Greek adventurer in the reign of Nero.^o

Simon is said to have taught that God existed from eternity in the depth of inaccessible light; that from him proceeded the Thought or Conception of his mind (*Ennoia*); that from God and the *Ennoia* emanated by successive generations pairs of male and female æons. The *Ennoia*, issuing forth from the Pleroma, produced a host of angels, by whom the world was made; and these, being ignorant of God, and unwilling to acknowledge any author of their being, rose against their female parent, subjected her to various indignities, and imprisoned her in a succession of material bodies. Thus at one time she had animated the form of the beautiful wife of Menelaus; and at last she had taken up her abode in that of the Tyrian Helena, the companion of Simon. The *Ennoia* herself remained throughout a pure spiritual essence as at the first; the pollutions and degradations of the persons in whom she had dwelt attached only to their material bodies, and were a part of the oppressions inflicted on the divine æon.^p

There are various statements as to the character which Simon claimed for himself. It has been said that he professed to be the Supreme God, who (he asserted) had revealed himself to the Samaritans as the Father, to the Jews as the Son, and to the Gentiles as the Holy Ghost;^q but it would seem rather that by professing to be the "great power of God" he meant to identify himself with the chief male æon of his system.^r

He taught that man was held in subjection by the angels who created the world; that not only were the Mosaic dispensation and the Old Testament prophecies to be referred to these, but the received distinctions of right and wrong were invented by them

ⁿ Constit. Apost. vi. 9; Theodoret. Hær. i. 1.

^o Sueton. Ner. 12; Juvenal, iii. 79. See Beausobre, i. 203; Burton, B. L. note 41.

^p Iren. I. xxiii. 2. Beausobre supposes the whole story of Helena to be an allegory relating to the soul, i. 35; ii. 324-5.

^q Iren. I. xxiii. 1; Epiphan. Hær. xxi. 1. See Bull, v. 270; Blunt on the

Fathers, 489. Baron Bunsen infers from the 'Philosophumena' that these words referred to Jesus, and not to Simon (i. 352). St. Jerome represents Simon as having said of himself in his writings, "Ego sum sermo Dei, ego sum speciosus, ego Paracletus, ego omnipotens, ego omnia Dei." In Matth. xxiv. 5 (t. vii. 176).

^r Mosh. Inst. Maj. 391; Matter, i. 266; Burton, B. L. 388.

for the purpose of enslaving mankind,^s and, consequently, that those who should trust in Simon and Helena need not concern themselves with the observance of any moral rules, since they were to be saved, not by works of righteousness, but by grace. Simon professed that he himself had descended from the highest heaven, for the purpose of rescuing the Ennoia—"the lost sheep," as he termed her^t—from the defilement of her fleshly prison, of revealing himself to men, and delivering them from the yoke of the angels. In passing through the spheres, he had in each assumed a suitable form; and thus on earth he appeared as a man.^u He was the same æon who had been known as Jesus—the Messiah. The history of our Lord's life and death he explained on the docetic principle.^x The resurrection of the body was denied; but as the soul, when set free, must pass through several spheres on its way to the Pleroma, and as the angels of those spheres had the power of impeding its flight, it was necessary to propitiate them, evil as they were in themselves, by sacrifices.^y

According to St. Epiphanius, Simon said that Helena was the Holy Spirit.^z As, then, that Person of the Godhead was held by him to have enlightened the Gentiles—(not, however, in the Christian sense, but by means of the Greek philosophy^a)—Helena was thus identified with the Greek goddess of wisdom, and was represented and worshipped in the character of Minerva, while Simon received like honours under the form of Jupiter.^b

The followers of Simon were divided into various sects, which are said to have been addicted to necromancy and other magical arts, and to have carried out in practice his doctrine of the indifference of actions.^c Justin Martyr states that in his day (about A.D. 140) Simon was worshipped as the chief god by almost all the Samaritans, and had adherents in other countries;^d but the heresy declined so rapidly that Origen, about a century later, questions whether it had so many as thirty adherents in the whole world.^e

II. Passing over Menander^f (whose doctrines were not so unlike those of his master, Simon, as to require a separate detail),

^s Iren. I. xxiii. 3. See Waterland, v. 636; Mosh. Inst. Maj. 417; Matter, i. 286.

^t Iren. I. xxiii. 2.

^u Ibid. 3; Epiph. xxi. 2-3; Mosh. Inst. Maj. 424.

^x Epiph. xxi. 1.

^y Tertull. de Præser. 33; Tillem. ii. 39; Mosh. Inst. Maj. 418.

^z xxi. 1; Matter, i. 277.

^a Matter, i. 265.

^b Iren. I. xxiii. 4; Matter, i. 280.

^c Iren. I. xxiii. 4.

^d Apol. i. 26.

^e Contr. Cels. i. 57; vi. 11.

^f See Just. Mart. Apol. i. 26; Iren. I. xxiii. 5; Epiphani. Hær. xxii.

and the Nicolaitans (as to whom nothing is known with certainty, beyond the denunciation of them in the Apocalypse^g), the next considerable name which we meet with is that of Cerinthus, who rose into notoriety in the reign of Domitian.

Cerinthus was a native of Judæa, and, after having studied at Alexandria, established himself as a teacher in his own country : but at a later time he removed to Ephesus, as a more promising scene for the diffusion of his tenets.^h St. John, who had been confronted with the father of heresy in the earliest days of the Gospel, was reserved for a contest with Cerinthus in the church over which he had long presided ; both in his Gospel and in his Epistles a reference to the errors of this heresiarch appears to be strongly marked.ⁱ

Unlike his predecessors, Cerinthus was content to be a teacher, without claiming for himself any place in his scheme. This was a link between the opposite systems of Judaism and Gnosticism, and would seem to have been in itself inconsistent, although we have no means of judging how the inventor attempted to reconcile its elements.^k He taught that the world was made by an angel, remote from the Supreme God, limited in capacity and in knowledge, ignorant of the Supreme, and yet unconsciously serving him. To this angel and others of the same order Cerinthus referred the Law and the Prophets ; the Old Testament, therefore, was not in the Cerinthian system regarded as evil, but as imperfect and subordinate. The nature of the Demiurge fixed a level above which the mass of the Jewish people could not rise ; but the elect among them had attained to a higher knowledge.^l Jesus was represented as a real man, born in the usual way of Joseph and Mary, and chosen by God to be the Messiah, on account of his eminent righteousness ; the æon Christ descended on him at his baptism, revealing the Most High to him, and enduing him with the power of miracles, to be exercised for the confirmation of his doctrine. The Demiurge, jealous at finding his power thus invaded, stirred up the Jewish rulers to persecute Jesus ; but before the crucifixion the æon Christ returned to the Pleroma. By some it is said that Cerinthus admitted the resurrection of Jesus ; by others, that he expected it to take place at the commencement of the Millennium, when the body was to be

^g ii. 15. See Clem. Alex. Strom. iii.

4. p. 522 ; Epiph. Hær. xxv.

^h Theodoret. Hær. ii. 3 ; Tillem. ii.

54. See Stanley on the Apostolic Age, ed. 1, p. 214.

ⁱ Waterland, iii. 539.

^k Matter, i. 298 ; Dorner, i. 314.

^l Iren. I. xxvi. 1 ; Mosh. Inst. Maj. 446-7, 456 ; Matter, i. 299 ; Neander, ii. 44.

reunited with the Christ from heaven.^m As it appears certain that Cerinthus allowed the resurrection of the body, he cannot have shared in the Gnostic views as to the inherently evil nature of matter.ⁿ

Although Christ had revealed the true spiritual Judaism, it was said that the outward preparatory system was to be retained in part during the present imperfect state of things; Cerinthus, therefore, required the observance of such Jewish usages as Jesus had sanctioned by himself submitting to them. The only part of the New Testament which he received was a mutilated Gospel of St. Matthew.^o

The doctrine of an earthly reign of Christ with his saints for a thousand years has been referred to Cerinthus as its author, and it has been said that his conceptions of the millennial happiness were grossly sensual. These assertions however, which rest on the authority of Caius, a Roman presbyter, who wrote about the year 210,^p have been much questioned. It seems clear that the millennarian opinions which soon after prevailed in the Church were not derived from Cerinthus, and that it was a controversial artifice to throw odium on them by tracing them to so discreditable a source.^q Nor, even if the morality of Cerinthus were as bad as his opponents represent it, can we well suppose him to have connected the notion of licentious indulgences with a state of bliss which was to have Christ for its sovereign.^r

III. While the Gnostics, imbued with the ideas of vastness and complexity which are characteristic of Oriental religions, looked down on Christianity as too simple,^s it had also to contend with enemies of an opposite kind. We very early find traces of a Judaizing tendency; and although the middle course adopted by the Council of Jerusalem, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit,^t was calculated to allay the differences which had arisen as to the obligation of the Mosaic law on those who had embraced the faith of Christ, oppositions on the side of Judaism often recur in the books of the New Testament.

This Judaism at length issued in the formation of distinct sects. The name of Nazarenes, which had originally been applied to all

^m Iren. I. xxvi. 1; Epiph. Hær. xxviii. 1; Theodoret. Hær. ii. 3; Burton, B. L. 176, 488; Dorner, i. 315-6.

ⁿ Mosh. Inst. Maj. 446, 556.

^o Epiph. xxviii. 5; Mosh. Inst. Maj. 454-5; Neander, ii. 46.

^p Ap. Euseb. iii. 28. See Heinichen's

note, and Burton, B. L. n. 76.

^q Mosh. Inst. Maj. 457; De Rebus Chr. 721-2; Maitland, Eruvin, ed. 2, pp. 163-9.

^r Schröckh, ii. 310.

^s Neander, ii. 46.

^t Acts xv.

Christians, became appropriated to the party which maintained that the law was binding on Christians of Jewish race, but did not wish to enforce it on Gentiles; while those who insisted on its obligation as universal were styled Ebionites. The Nazarenes are generally supposed to have been orthodox,^u and to have been acknowledged as such by the Church; the Ebionites were unquestionably heretical.

The name of the latter party has been variously derived—from that of a supposed founder, and from a Hebrew word which signifies *poor*.^x The existence of Ebion is now generally disbelieved; but there remains the question how the title of *poor* came to be attached to the sect,—whether it was given by opponents, with a reference to the meagreness and beggarly character of their doctrines;^y or whether it was assumed by themselves, as significant of their voluntary poverty, and with an allusion to the beatitude of the “poor in spirit.”^z

The formation of the sect, as such, is dated by some in the reign of Domitian, or earlier.^a By others it is supposed that the separation of both Ebionites and Nazarenes took place as late as A.D. 136-8, and that it was caused by the adoption of Gentile usages in the Church of Jerusalem;^b while a third view connects the schism of the Ebionites with the statement of Hegesippus,^c that one Thebuthis, having been disappointed in aspiring to the bishoprick of Jerusalem, began to corrupt the Church—a supposition by which the origin of Ebionism would be fixed about the year 107.^d

^u In their origin, at least, although they did not keep pace with the Church's later investigations and definitions as to doctrine. They lasted till the fifth century. Dorner, i. 306-9. See Walch, i. 108-9; Matter, iii. 12-3.

^x Origen gives the Hebrew derivation (De Princip. iv. 22; C. Cels. ii. 1). Tertullian is the earliest writer who speaks of Ebion as a person (De Præscr. 33). See, for authorities on both sides, Burton, B. L. note 80. In other cases of the same time we find a like contest between what may be called the personal and the etymological views; e.g., as to Thebuthis, and as to the origin of the Nicolaitans and the Elxaites. It is easy to understand that a name given to a sect on account of its significance may have been afterwards erroneously derived from the supposed name of an imaginary founder. But, on the other hand, as names were generally signifi-

cant, it would seldom happen that the name of a heresiarch could not be somehow interpreted as referring to his doctrines. Perhaps we may find it useful for the determination of such questions to ask whether the names are so strikingly appropriate that they would probably have been *chosen* in order to characterise the sects.

^y Euseb. iii. 27.

^a Neander, i. 476-7. Gieseler thinks that it may have been originally given in contempt by the Jews to all Christians, I. i. 131.

^b Tillem. ii. 107; Schröckh, ii. 317.

^c See above, p. 21. Mosheim, 326; Gibbon, i. 461; Neander, i. 475-6; Schliemann, 407.

^d Ap. Euseb. iv. 22.

^e This is the opinion of Gieseler, who shows (I. i. 130) that the bishop whom Thebuthis wished to succeed was more likely Symeon than James the Just.

In opposition to the Gnostics, the Ebionites held that the world was the work of God himself.^e As to the person of Christ, although some of them are said to have admitted his miraculous birth,^f while they denied his Godhead and his pre-existence, they for the most part supposed him to be a mere man, the offspring of Joseph and Mary, who was chosen for his piety to be the Messiah and son of God. They believed that this high destination was unknown to him, until at his baptism it was revealed by Elias, in the person of John the Baptist;^g and that he then received a heavenly influence,^h which forsook him again before his crucifixion.ⁱ

It would seem that the Ebionites were divided as to their view of the Old Testament. Some of them supposed Christianity to differ from the Law only by the addition of certain features;^k while the adepts regarded it as a restoration of the genuine Mosaic system, which they supposed to have been corrupted in the Old Testament.^l These more advanced members of the sect considered Moses to be the only true prophet; they rejected, not only the later Jewish traditions, but the whole of the Hebrew Scriptures, except the Pentateuch; and even it they did not admit as the work of Moses himself, but, by ascribing it to reporters, who had wilfully or ignorantly corrupted his words, they found a pretext for rejecting so much of it as did not fall in with their principles.^m Of the New Testament they admitted no part, except a Hebrew Gospel of St. Matthew, in which the account of our Lord's birth was omitted. They relied much on apocryphal scriptures, and were especially hostile to St. Paul.ⁿ

Although some corruptions of morals are attributed to the later Ebionites,^o the practice of the sect in its earlier days was undoubt-

^e Iren. I. xxvi. 2.

^f See Burton, B. L. n. 83. For a refutation of the heterodox writers who have attempted to represent Ebionitism as the characteristic not of a sect but of a period (so that, according to their view, the first Christians were Ebionites), see the same note; also Schliemann, 369; Dörner, i. 222, 230, 265, 342.

^g Thus an idea which the Jews of the time entertained as to their expected Messiah (Just. Mart. Dial. c. Tryph. 8) was transferred to the real Saviour.

^h Iren. V. i. 3; Epiph. Hær. xxx. 2. In the Gospel of the Ebionites the voice from heaven at the Saviour's baptism was said to have uttered the words, "Thou art my beloved Son, in whom I

am well pleased. . . . I have *this day* begotten thee." Ellicott on the Apocryphal Gospels, in Cambridge Essays, 1856, p. 180.

ⁱ Orig. c. Cels. v. 61; Theodoret. Hær. ii. 1. Gieseler supposes that Origen, in speaking of a difference among the Ebionites on this point, includes the Nazarenes under the name (I. ii. 131). Schliemann and others understand the distinction to be between two classes of the Ebionites properly so called.

^k Neander, i. 479.

^l Schliemann, 377, 498.

^m Epiph. xxx. 18; Schliemann, 514.

ⁿ Iren. I. xxvi. 2; Epiph. xxx. 15-6.

^o Epiph. xxx. 2.

edly strict. Some parties among them renounced all property, and abstained not only from the flesh, but from the produce of animals.^p In their worship and polity they affected Jewish usages and terms; they practised circumcision and ceremonial ablutions; they rigidly observed the Jewish sabbath; they had *synagogues*, *rulers*, and the like. They celebrated the Eucharist with unleavened bread, and used only water in the cup.^q Like the Cerinthians, they held the doctrine of an earthly reign of Christ, who was to make Jerusalem the seat of his power, to subdue all enemies, and to raise the Jewish kingdom to a splendour before unknown.^r

Ebionism continued to exist in Syria and Peræa as late as the end of the fourth century.^s

IV. Menander, who has been mentioned as the successor of Simon Magus, is said to have been the master of two noted heretics, who may be considered as the founders respectively of the Syrian and of the Alexandrian Gnosticism—Saturninus and Basilides.^t

Saturninus, who was born at Antioch, and there established his school,^u taught that the Supreme God, or “Unknown Father,” produced a multitude of spiritual beings; that in the lowest gradation of the spiritual world, close on the borders which separate the realm of light from the chaos of matter, were seven angels, the rulers of the planets; and that these angels took a portion from the material mass and shaped it into a world, the regions of which they divided among themselves—the God of the Jews being their chief.^x A bright shape, let down for a moment from the distant source of light, and then withdrawn, excited new desires and projects in them: unable as they were to lay hold on and to fix the dazzling image, they endeavoured to frame a man after its likeness; but their creature was only able to grovel on the earth like a worm, until the Father in pity sent down to him a spark of his own divine life.^y But in opposition to the elect race, Satan, the lord of matter, with whom the angels carried on an unceasing warfare, produced an unholy race, and the elect, while they sojourn in this world, are exposed to assaults from him

^p Epiph. xxx. 15, 17, 22.

^q Iren. I. xxvi. 2; Epiph. xxx. 15, 16, 18, 21.

^r Iren. loc. cit.; Burton, B. L. 184; Neander, i. 481; Matter, iii. 19.

^s Gieseler, I. i. 131. For the smaller varieties, Elxaites, &c., see Matter, iii.

19, seqq.; Gieseler, I. i. 132; Burton, Ch. Hist. ii. 20.

^t Euseb. iv. 7. See Clinton, A.D. 134.

^u See Clinton, ii. 403.

^x Iren. I. xxiv. 2; Epiph. xxiii. 1.

^y Iren. I. xxiv. 1.

and from his agents both human and spiritual.^z The Old Testament was in part given by the seven angels, especially by the God of the Jews, and in part by Satan.^a

In order to deliver the elect from their enemies, and also from their subjection to the God of the Jews and the other planetary angels, who aimed at establishing an independent kingdom, the Father sent down the æon *Nous* (Mind), or Christ, clothed with a phantastic body.^b At the consummation of all things, the bodies of the elect were to be resolved into their elements, while the soul was to re-enter into the bosom of the unknown Father, from whom it was derived.^c

The precepts of Saturninus were strictly ascetic; he forbade marriage, and the propagation of mankind;^d but it would seem that the more rigid observances were required only of the highest grade among his followers.^e The sect did not extend beyond Syria, and soon came to an end.

V. Basilides, who became conspicuous about the year 125,^f is said to have been, like Saturninus, a Syrian; but it was at Alexandria that he fixed himself,^g and the leading character of his system was Egyptian. He taught that from the Supreme God were evolved, by successive generation, seven intelligences (which were, in fact, personified attributes), Understanding, Word, Thought, Wisdom, Power, Righteousness, and Peace.^h These gave birth to a second order of spirits; the second to a third; and the course of emanations continued until there were three hundred and sixty-five orders, each consisting of seven spirits, and each with a heaven of its own, while every heaven, with its inhabitants, was an inferior antitype of that immediately above it.ⁱ The number of the heavens was expressed in the Greek notation by the letters of the word *Abraxas* or *Abrasax* (Ἀβρασαῶξ), which the most approved interpretations derive from the Coptic, and explain as meaning *new word* or *sacred word*.^k The same name

^z Ib. 1-2. On this point there is some difference. See Mosh. 336-8; Matter, i. 333, 342; Gieseler, I. i. 191; Ritter, v. 119.

^a Iren. I. xxiv. 2.

^b Ibid.

^c Ib. 1; Mosh. 340; Matter, i. 337.

^d Epiph. xxiii. 2.

^e Mosh. 341; Matter, i. 346.

^f Gieseler, I. i. 185. Clinton (ii. 403) places him in 134.

^g Epiph. xxiii. 1; xxiv. 1; Matter, i. 402.

^h Iren. I. xxiv. 3. See Ritter, v. 125-8.

These might have been derived either from the seven Amshaspands of the Zoroastrian creed, or from the seven Sephiroth of the Cabala. But since they are spoken of as forming, with the Supreme, the first *oydoad* (octave), M. Matter thinks that they are rather to be traced to the Egyptian system, in which that term was used.

ⁱ Iren. I. xxiv. 3; Neander, ii. 49.

^k "New word," according to Münter; "sacred word," according to Beller-mann. (Matter, i. 415.) See other in-

was used also to denote the providence which directs the universe—not the Supreme God as he is in himself (since he is represented as “not to be named”), but God in so far as he is *manifested*, or the collective hierarchy of emanations.^m

The angels of the lowest heaven (which is that which is seen from earth) formed the world and its inhabitants after a pattern shown to them by the æon *Sophia* or Wisdom.ⁿ The chief angel of this order, who is called the *Archon*, or Ruler, was the God of the Jews, while the other regions of the world were divided by lot among his brother angels;^o and, in consequence of the Archon's desire to exalt his own people above the rest of mankind, the other angels had stirred up the nations to enmity against the Jews.^p The Pentateuch was given by the Archon; the prophecies came from the other angels.^q

Man received from the creative angels a soul which is the seat of the senses and of the passions; and in addition to this the Supreme God bestowed on him a rational and higher soul, which the inferior soul is continually endeavouring to weaken.^r Although Basilides cannot rightly be described as a dualist,^s he held that throughout all nature there had been an encroachment of evil on good, “like rust on steel,”^t and that the object of the present state was to enable the souls of men (which, as they had come from God, could never perish, but must return to him) to disengage themselves from the entanglements of evil. The knowledge of God had become faint among men; the Archon himself, although he had served as an instrument of the Supreme in giving the Law, was yet ignorant of its true character—of its spiritual significance and its preparatory office—which the spiritual among the Jews had alone been able to discern.^u In order, then, to enlighten mankind, to deliver them from the limited system of the Archon, and enable them to rise towards the Supreme, the first-begotten æon, *Nous* or Understanding, descended on Jesus, the holiest of men, at his baptism;^x and by this manifestation the Archon learnt for the first time his own real place in the scale of the universe. The later Basilidians represented him as exasperated by the discovery, so that he insti-

interpretations in Beausobre, ii. 53, seqq. The word occurred also in Egyptian mythology.

^m Iren. I. xxiv. 7; Matter, i. 412; Gieseler, I. i. 186. Mosheim explains it differently (347).

ⁿ Clem. Alex. Strom. iv. 13, p. 603; Mosh. 350.

^o Epiph. xxiv. 2.

^p Iren. I. xxiv. 4.

^q Ibid. 7.

^r Clem. Alex. Strom. ii. 20, p. 488; Mosh. 343; Matter, ii. 12.

^s Matter, i. 407.

^t Clem. Alex. Strom. iv. 12, p. 603; Ritter, v. 133.

^u Neander, ii. 58; Ritter, v. 141.

^x Iren. I. xxiv. 4. The festival of Christ's baptism was kept on Jan. 6 with great solemnity by the sect. Clem. Alex. Strom. i. 21, p. 408; Gieseler, I. i. 186.

gated the Jews to persecute Jesus; but it is a question whether the founder of the sect shared in this view,^y or whether he supposed the Archon to have reverently acquiesced in the knowledge of his inferior position.^z

The doctrine of an atonement was inconsistent with the principles of Basilides. He allowed no other justification than that of advancement in sanctification,^a and laid it down that every one suffers for his own sins. God, he said, forgives no sins but such as are done unwillingly or in ignorance;^b all other sin must be expiated, and, until the expiation be complete, the soul must pass, under the guidance of its guardian angels, through one body after another,—not only human bodies, but also those of the lower creatures.^c And thus such suffering as cannot be traced to any visible cause is to be regarded as the purgation of sin committed in some former existence, while the death of the innocent may be the punishment of germs of evil which would have grown up if life had been continued. On this principle Basilides even accounted for the sufferings of the man Jesus himself;^d and by such theories he intended to justify the providential government of the world, as to which he is reported to have declared that he would “rather say anything than find fault with Providence.”^e

While the Gnostics in general spoke of faith and knowledge as opposites, Basilides taught that faith must run through the whole spiritual progress, and that the degrees of knowledge increase in proportion as faith becomes fitted to receive them.^f He divided his disciples into several grades; in order to admission among the highest adepts, a silence of five years was required.^g The authorities on which Basilides chiefly relied were some prophecies which bore the names of Ham, Parchor, Barcobas, and Barcoph, with an esoteric tradition which he professed to derive from St. Matthias and from Glaucias, an interpreter of St. Peter.^h He dealt with the New Testament in an arbitrary way; he did not reject St. Paul, but placed him below St. Peter, and declared some of the epistles ascribed to him to be spurious.ⁱ

^y This is the opinion of the older writers for the most part, and of Matter, ii. 8.

^z So Clem. Alex. Strom. ii. 8, p. 449; Neander, ii. 63; Gieseler, I. i. 186.

^a Neander, ii. 66.

^b Clem. Alex. Strom. iv. 24.

^c Origen in Rom. v. 1 (t. iv. p. 549); Neander, ii. 54, 57; Matter, ii. 3. Thus Basilides explained the visiting of sins “to the third and fourth generation.”

Excerpta ex Theodoto, 28, ap. Clem. Alex. t. ii. 976.

^d Clem. Strom. iv. 12, p. 60; Mosh. 353-7; Matter, i. 432; ii. 9; Kaye on Clem. Alex. 266; Ritter, v. 131.

^e Clem. loc. cit.

^f Neander, ii. 67-8.

^g Euseb. iv. 7; Matter, ii. 18.

^h Clem. Strom. vii. 17, pp. 898, 900; Theodoret, Hæc. i. 4.

ⁱ Matter, i. 404.

This system became more popular than any that had preceded it,^k and St. Jerome informs us that even in the fifth century Basilidianism continued to exist.^l The doctrines of the sect, however, were much corrupted in the course of time. The view of Judaism was altered; the Archon came to be regarded as opposed to the Supreme God; and consequently the Gnostic was at liberty to trample on all that had proceeded from the inferior power, to disregard all the laws of morality.^m Instead of the doctrine which Basilides held in common with some other sectaries, that the æon who descended on Jesus at baptism forsook him before his crucifixion, a strange docetic fancy was introduced—that his body was phantastical, and that he transferred his own form to Simon of Cyrene, who suffered in his stead on the cross, while Jesus in the form of Simon stood by and derided the executioners. The Gnostic, therefore, was not to confess the crucifixion; those who should own it were still under bondage to the Archon.ⁿ The later Basilidians made no scruple of eating idol sacrifices, or of taking part in heathen rites and festivities; they denied their faith in time of persecution, and mocked at martyrdom as a folly, inasmuch as the object for whom it was borne was the crucified Simon.^o They were also addicted to magic; he, it was said, who shall master the whole system, who shall know the names and origin of all the angels, will become superior, invisible, and incomprehensible to them.^p Most of the gems which are found inscribed with the mystical *Abraxas* are supposed to have been used by the sect as amulets or talismans, although it is certain that some of these symbols were purely heathen.^q

VI. Of all the Gnostic leaders Valentinus was the most eminent for ability; his system was distinguished beyond the rest for its complex and elaborate character, and it surpassed them all in popularity.

Valentinus is supposed to have been of Jewish descent, but was a native of Egypt and studied at Alexandria.^r He appears to have been brought up as a Christian, or at least to have professed Christianity in early life; hence his doctrine, with all its wildness,

^k Matter, ii. 17.

^l Ep. lxxv. 3. He speaks of it as lately rampant in Spain.

^m Iren. I. xxiv. 5; Mosh. 358; Neander, ii. 114; Matter, ii. 21. It is the later Basilidianism that Irenæus describes; for the earlier system Clement of Alexandria is the chief authori-

ty. Gieseler, I. i. 186.

ⁿ Iren. I. xxiv. 4.

^o Epiph. xxiv. 4; Matter, ii. 24.

^p Iren. I. xxiv. 6.

^q Mosh. 349–350; Schröckh, ii. 351; Matter, ii. 421; Gieseler, I. i. 186.

^r Tillem. ii. 257.

had a greater infusion of Scriptural language and ideas than those of the older Gnostic teachers.^s Tertullian states that he became a heresiarch on being disappointed of a bishoprick; but it does not appear in what stage of his career the disappointment occurred, and the story has been altogether questioned.^t

It was about the year 140 that Valentinus visited Rome, where Irenæus states that he remained from the pontificate of Hyginus to that of Anicetus.^u The Roman Church, in its simple and severe orthodoxy, was less tolerant of novelties than that from which he had come; ^v he was twice excommunicated, and on his final exclusion retired to Cyprus, where he wrought out and published his system. His death is supposed to have taken place about 160,—whether in Cyprus or at Rome is uncertain.^w

In his doctrines Valentinus appears to have borrowed from the religions of Egypt and of Persia, from the Cabala, from Plato, from Pythagoras, and from the Hesiodic Theogony.^x He supposed a First Principle, self-existent and perfect, to whom he gave the name of *Bythos* (*i. e.* unfathomable depth). This being, who from eternity had existed in repose, at length resolved to manifest himself; from him and the *Ennoia* or Conception of his mind, who was also named *Charis* (Grace), or *Sige* (Silence), were produced a pair of æons,—the male styled *Nous* (Understanding), or *Monogenes* (Only-begotten); the female, *Aletheia* (Truth). From these, by successive generations, emanated two other pairs,—*Logos* (the Word, or Reason) and *Zoë* (Life), *Anthropos* (Man) and *Ecclesia* (the Church). Thus was composed the first grade of beings—the *Ogdoad*, or Octave.^y Next, from *Logos* and *Zoë*, were produced five pairs of æons,—the *Decad*; and then from *Anthropos* and *Ecclesia*, six pairs,—the *Dodecad*; making up in all the number of thirty.^z In addition to these there was an unwedded æon, named *Horos* (Boundary), or *Stauros* (the Cross), the offspring of *Bythos* and *Sige*, whose office it was to enforce the principle of limitation, and keep every existence in its proper place.^a

The first-begotten, *Nous*, alone was capable of comprehending

^s Mosh. 376.

^t Tert. adv. Valentinianos, 4; see Mosheim, 372; Matter, ii. 38; Ritter, vi. 194.

^u Iren. III. iv. 3; Clinton, ii. 404.

^v Matter, ii. 46.

^w Tillem. ii. 258–9, 603; Mosh. 371.

^x Mosh. 375; Matter, ii. 57–8; Ritter, vi. 192–3.

^y Iren. I. i. The sex of these beings answers to the gender of the Greek

name of each. Kaye on Tertullian, 484.

^z Iren. I. i.

^a Ibid. ii. 2–4; iii. 5. For this genealogy the Valentinians claimed the authority of St. Paul's words, *εις πασας τας γενεας του αιωνος των αιωνων* (Eph. iii. 21); and wherever the word *αιων* occurred in Scripture, or in the Liturgy, they referred it to the æons of their own system. Iren. I. iii. 1.

the Supreme Father. The other æons envied this knowledge, and in proportion to their remoteness from the source was the vehemence of their desire to fathom it. *Sophia* (Wisdom), the last of the thirty, filled with an uncontrollable eagerness, issued forth from the Pleroma, with the intention of soaring up to the original of her being; but she was in danger of being absorbed into the infinity of his nature, or of being lost in the boundless void without, when Horos led her back to the sphere which she had so rashly forsaken.^b Nous now, by the providence of Bythos, produced a new pair of æons—Christ and the Holy Spirit.^c Christ taught the elder æons that Bythos was incomprehensible—that they could only know him through the Only-begotten, and that the happiness of every being was to rest content with such measure of light as had been allotted to it; the Spirit established equality among them, and taught them to unite in glorifying the Supreme. Harmony was restored, and all the æons combined to produce *Jesus* (or Saviour), the flower of the Pleroma, endowed by each with the most precious gift which he could contribute. With him were also produced a host of attendant angels.^d

But while *Sophia* was on her flight beyond the Pleroma, her longings had, without the co-operation of her partner *Theletos* (Will), given birth to an abortive, shapeless, and imperfect being called by the name of *Achamoth*.^e This being remained shut out from the Pleroma, and in utter darkness; when Christ, taking pity on her, bestowed on her a form, and showed her a momentary glimpse of the celestial brightness.^f *Achamoth* endeavoured to approach it, but was repelled by Horos.^g On this she was seized with violent agitations; sometimes she smiled at the remembrance of the glorious vision; sometimes she wept at her exclusion. Her emotions acted on the inert and formless mass of matter;^h from her turning towards the source of light was produced psychicⁱ ex-

^b Iren. I. ii. 1-2; Mosh. 379; Matter, ii. 68. I have given in the text both the interpretations which have been proposed for εἰς τὴν ὅλην οὐσίαν ἀναλελύσθαι.

^c Iren. I. ii. 5. These are generally described as a pair. See Matter, ii. 70. But Mosheim (p. 374) supposes them to have been single and independent, like Horos.

^d Iren. I. ii. 5-6; Tertull. adv. Valent. 12. Irenæus compares the account of the Valentinian Jesus to the heathen fable of Pandora. II. xiv. 5.

^e i. e. Wisdom, from חֵכֶם. The name was borrowed from the Cabala. *Achamoth* is also called ἐνθύμησις, and

is distinguished from her mother as the *nether wisdom* (ἡ κάτω σοφία). Gieseler, I. i. 188; Matter, ii. 72.

^f Mosh. 380; Iren. I. ii. 2-3; Tertull. adv. Valent. 13.

^g Tertull. 14.

^h Mosh. 381-2; Matter, ii. 74. Matter is in this system represented not as actively evil, but as inert and negative—*κένωμα* (void), as opposed to *πλήρωμα* (fulness). Matter, ii. 84-6.

ⁱ This word is usually Latinized by *animale*; but the English *animal* does not answer to it. It relates to the principle of life, and may sometimes, but not always, be rendered *vital*.

istence; from her grief at being left in darkness and vacuity, from her fear lest life should be withdrawn from her, as the light had been, was produced material existence. Among the material productions were Satan and his angels; among the psychic, the Demiurge. She turns in supplication to the Christ, who sends down to her the æon Jesus, attended by his angels, and equipped with the power of the whole Pleroma. Jesus enlightens Achamoth and calms her agitation; from the brightness of his angels she conceives, and gives birth to pneumatic or spiritual existence.^k The Demiurge sets to work on the surrounding chaos, separates the psychic from the material elements, and out of the former builds seven heavens, the highest of which is his own sphere, while each of the others is committed to a superintendent angel. He then makes man, bestowing on him a psychic soul and body; but Achamoth, without the knowledge of the Demiurge, implants in the new creature a spark of spiritual nature; and the Creator and his angels stand amazed on discovering that their workmanship has in it the element of something higher than themselves.

The Demiurge becomes jealous of man. He places him under a narrow and oppressive law; and, when man breaks this, he thrusts him down from the third heaven, or paradise, to earth, and envelopes his psychic body in a "coat of skin"—a fleshly prison, subjecting the man to the bonds of matter (for thus Valentinus explained Genesis iii. 21). All this, however, happened through the providence of the Supreme, whose design it was that, by entering into the world of matter, the spiritual element should become the means of its destruction.^l

The Demiurge knew of nothing superior to himself; he had acted as the instrument of Bythos, but unconsciously. He supposes himself to be the original of the universe, and instructs the Jewish prophets to proclaim him as the only God. In their writings, accordingly, Valentinus professed to distinguish between the things which they had uttered by the inspiration of the limited Demiurge, and those which, without being themselves aware of it, they had derived from a higher source.^m The Demiurge taught the prophets to promise a Messiah according to his own conceptions; he framed this Messiah of a psychic soul with a psychic and immaterial body, capable of performing human actions, yet exempt

^k Iren. I. iv.; Tertull. adv. Valent. 22.

^l i. 258. Cassian. ap. Clem. Alex. Strom. iii. 14; Exc. ex Theodoto, 55, ap. Clem. Alex. t. ii. p. 982; Neander, ii. 82-3; Matter, ii. 81; Rossell, in Bun-

sen's Hippolytus, i. 152. Irenæus seems to suppose that man's body was represented as *originally* material. I. v.

^m Iren. I. v. 4; vii. 3.

from human feelings; and to these elements, without the knowledge of his maker, was added a pneumatic soul from the world above. This "nether Christ" was born of the Virgin Mary—passing through her "as water through a tube," without taking anything of her substance; he ate and drank, but derived no nourishment from his earthly food.ⁿ For thirty years—a period which had reference to the number of inhabitants in the Pleroma^o—he lived as a pattern of ascetic righteousness, until at his baptism the æon Jesus descended on him, with the design of fulfilling the most exalted meaning of prophecy, which the Demiurge had not understood; and then the Demiurge became aware of the higher spiritual world,^p and gladly yielded himself as an instrument for the advancement of the Messiah's kingdom.^q

Valentinus divided men into three classes, represented by Cain, Abel, and Seth respectively—the material, who could not attain to knowledge, or be saved; the spiritual, who could not be lost; and the psychic, who might be saved or lost, according to their works.^r Heathenism was said to be material, Judaism and the Christianity of the Church psychic, and Gnosticism spiritual;^s but it was not denied that individuals might be either above or below the level of the systems which they professed. Among the Jews, in particular, there had always been a class of lofty spiritual natures, which rose above the limits of the old dispensation. The Demiurge had discerned the superior virtue of these, and had rewarded them by making them prophets and kings, while he ignorantly imagined that their goodness was derived from himself.^t

The pure truth was for the first time revealed to mankind by the coming of Christ. To the spiritual his mission was for the purpose of enlightenment; their nature is akin to the Pleroma, and they are to enter into it through knowledge, which unites them with Christ. But for the psychic a different redemption was necessary; and this was wrought out by the sufferings of the psychic Messiah, who before his crucifixion was abandoned, not only by the æon Jesus, but by his own spiritual soul.^u Valentinus, therefore, differed from Basilides and others by allowing a kind of atonement; but his doctrine on this point was very unlike that of

ⁿ Iren. I. vi. 1; Valent. ap. Clem. Theodoto, 54; Epiph. xxxi. 7.
Alex. Strom. iii. 7, p. 538.

^o Iren. I. i. 3.

^p Matter, ii. 87–90; Neander, ii. 88.

^q Iren. I. vii. 2–4.

^r Ib. I. vi. 1; vii. 5; Excerpta ex

^s Iren. I. vi. 2–4.

^t Ib. vii. 2; Mosheim, 387; Neander, ii. 85; Matter, ii. 83–6.

^u Iren. I. vii. 2; Mosh. 386; Matter,

ii. 83.

the Church, inasmuch as he did not truly recognise either the divinity or the humanity of the Saviour.*

Christ, it was held, enters into connexion with all natures, in order that each may rise to a bliss suitable to its capacity. At baptism the psychic class obtain the forgiveness of their sins, with knowledge and power to master the material elements which cleave to them; while the spiritual are set free from the dominion of the Demiurge, are incorporated into the Pleroma, and each enters into fellowship with a corresponding angelic being in the world above.^y The courses of the two classes were to be throughout distinct. For the psychics, faith was necessary, and, in order to produce it, miracles were requisite; but the spiritual were above the need of such assistances; *they* were to be saved, not by faith but by knowledge—a doctrine which among the later Valentinians became the warrant for all manner of licentiousness.^z The literal sense of Scripture was for the psychics, who were unable to penetrate beyond it; but the spiritual were admitted to the understanding of a higher meaning—"the wisdom of the perfect."^a

At the final consummation, when the spiritual shall all have been perfected in knowledge—when all the seeds of divine life among mankind shall have been delivered from the bondage of matter—Achamoth, whose place is now in a middle region, between the Pleroma and the highest heaven of the Demiurge,^b will enter into the Pleroma, and be united with the heavenly bridegroom Jesus. The matured spiritual natures, shaking off all that is lower, and restoring their psychic souls to the Demiurge who gave them, will follow into the Pleroma—each to be united with its angelic partner. The Demiurge will rise from his own heaven to the middle region, where he will reign over the psychic righteous. Then the fire which is now latent in the frame of the world will burst forth, and will annihilate all that is material.^c

The Valentinian system was plausible in the eyes of Christians, inasmuch as it not only used a Scriptural terminology, but professed to receive all the books of Scripture, while it was able to set their meaning aside by the most violent misinterpretations.^d

* Matter. ii. 92; Neander, ii. 86-7.

^y Heracleon, ap. Origen. in Joann. t. xiii. 11; Tillem. ii. 261; Neander, ii. 92.

^z Iren. I. vi. 3.

^a Tillem. ii. 261; Neander. ii. 93-4; Matter, ii. 83; Gieseler, I. i. 188.

^b Iren. I. v. 4.

^c Iren. I. vii. 1-5; Exc. ex Theod. 65;

Tertull. adv. Valent. 32; Neander, ii. 90-5.

^d Iren. I. iii. 2. "Neque enim si Valentinus integro instrumento uti videtur, non callidiore ingenio quam Marcion, manus intulit veritati. Marcion enim exerte et palam machæra, non stylo, usus est; quoniam ad materiam suam eadem scripturarum confecit. Valen-

The Gospel of St. John was regarded by the sect as the highest in authority; but the key to the true doctrine was said to be derived by secret tradition from St. Matthias, and from Theodas, a disciple of St. Paul.^e The initiation into the mysteries was gradual; Irenæus tells us that they were disclosed to such persons only as would pay largely, and Tertullian describes with sarcastic humour the manner in which the sectaries baffled the curiosity of any who attempted to penetrate beyond the degree of knowledge with which they might safely be entrusted.^f After the death of their founder the Valentinians underwent the usual processes of division and corruption; Epiphanius states that there were ten varieties of them.^g A remnant of the sect existed in the beginning of the fifth century.^h

VII. While the system of Valentinus was the most imaginative form of Gnosticism, that of his contemporary Marcion was the most prosaic and practical; and whereas in the other systems knowledge was all in all, the tendency of Marcionism was mainly religious.ⁱ The chief principle which its author had in common with other Gnostics was the idea of an opposition between Christianity and Judaism; and this he carried to an extreme.^j

Marcion was born at Sinope,^k on the Euxine, about the beginning of the second century. His father was eventually bishop of that city; and there is no apparent reason for doubting that Marcion was trained as a Christian from infancy.^l He rose to be a presbyter in the church of Sinope, and professed an ascetic life until (according to a very doubtful story, which rests on the authority of Epiphanius) he was excommunicated by his father for the seduction of a virgin.^m After in vain seeking to be restored,

tinus autem pepercit; quia non ad materiam scripturas, sed materiam ad scripturas, excogitavit." Tertull. de Præscr. 38.

^e Clem. Alex. Strom. vii. 17, pp. 898, 900; Matter, ii. 46, 98.

^f Iren. I. iv. 2; Tert. adv. Valent. 1.

^g Iren. I. xi.; Tertull. 4, 33, seqq.; Epiph. xxxi. 1.

^h Matter, ii. 126.

ⁱ Dorner, i. 354.

^j Neander, ii. 130.

^k Tertullian, in attacking him, does not forget another celebrated native of Sinope: "Illa canicula Diogenes hominem invenire cupiebat, lucernam meridie circumferens: Marcion Deum quem invenerat, extincto lumine fidei suæ amisit." Adv. Marc. i. 1.

^l Tert. adv. Marc. i. 1. Matter (ii. 226), however, suggests that possibly the father's conversion may have been later. Tertullian styles Marcion *nauclerus*; and often uses nautical and mercantile figures in speaking of him (e.g. v. 1). This may mean that in early years the heresiarch had led a seafaring life; but it is more likely only an allusion to his Pontic birth. See Cave, Hist. Lit. i. 34; Tillem. ii. 277; Beausobre, ii. 70; Kaye on Tertullian, 450.

^m Epiph. xlii. 1. The silence of Irenæus and other early writers—especially that of Tertullian—is a strong negative disproof of this story. (See Beausobre, ii. 77; Evans, i. 97; Neander, ii. 136; Bunsen, i. 163.) Yet M. Matter believes it (ii. 226). Mosheim (402-3), follow-

he left Asia, and arrived at Rome while the see was vacant through the death of Hyginus. He applied for admission into the communion of the Church, but was told by the presbyters that the principle of unity in faith and discipline forbade it unless with the consent of the bishop by whom he had been excommunicated.^o Before leaving his own country Marcion had become notorious for peculiar opinions, which, indeed, were probably the real cause of his excommunication. He now began to vent these by asking the Roman presbyters to explain our Lord's declaration that old bottles are unfit to receive new wine. He disputed the correctness of their answer; and, although his own interpretation of the words is not reported, there is no doubt that he supposed the "old bottles" to mean the Law, and the "new wine" the Gospel.^p

Having failed in his attempts to be readmitted into the Church, he attached himself to Cerdon, a Syrian, who had for some years sojourned at Rome, alternately making proselytes in secret and seeking reconciliation with the Church by a profession of penitence.^q The fame of the master was soon lost in that of the disciple, so that it is not known what was the share of each in the formation of their system.^r Marcion is said to have travelled in Egypt and the East, for the purpose of spreading his heresy, and is supposed to have died at Rome in the episcopate of Eleutherius.^s Tertullian states that he had been repeatedly excluded from the Church; that, on the last occasion, the bishop of Rome restored to him a large sum of money, which he had offered "in the first ardour of his faith;"^t that he obtained a promise of being once more received into communion, on condition of bringing back those whom he had perverted; but that death overtook him before he could fulfil the task.^u

ing a hint of Beausobre (ii. 82), supposes Epiphanius to have misunderstood some figurative account in which Marcion's heresy was described as a defilement of the *Church's* virgin purity. Marcion is a favourite with Neander, and still more so with Baron Bunsen, who decrees that he is the author of the 'Epistle to Diognetus,' an anonymous piece, ascribed by some to Justin Martyr. *Analecta Antenicæna*, i. 103.

^o Epiphanius, xlii. 2. *Comp. Canon. Apost.* 32. Beausobre (ii. 76) notices the inconsistency of this with later Roman claims. See too *Nat. Alex.* v. 89, seqq.

^p Epiphanius, l. c.; *Mosh.* 403; Neander, ii. 136-7; Matter, ii. 232. Compare the

Manichæan Faustus, in Augustin. c. Faust. l. xv.

^q Iren. I. xxvii. 1; III. iv. 3; Epiph. xli.

^r Neander, ii. 138; Matter, ii. 224.

^s See Tillemont, ii. 278. Mr. Clinton infers from Clem. Alex. Strom. iv. p. 500 B, that he was alive at the date of that work, A.D. 194.

^t Adv. Marcion. iv. 4; De Præser. Hær. 30. Neander supposes this gift to have been made in Asia, and on the occasion of Marcion's conversion (ii. 133). But the scene is commonly laid at Rome; and we have seen that he was most likely brought up as a Christian.

^u Neander (ii. 139), and Baron Bunsen (i. 169), who are unwilling to admit any-

Unlike the other Gnostics, Marcion professed to be purely Christian in his doctrines; he borrowed nothing from Greece, Egypt, or Persia, and acknowledged no other source of truth but the Holy Scripture; he was an enemy to allegorical interpretation; while he rejected the tradition of the Church, he did not pretend to have any secret tradition of his own; and he denied the opposition between faith and knowledge.^y But with Scripture itself he dealt very violently. He rejected the whole Old Testament; of the New, he acknowledged only the Gospel of St. Luke and ten of St. Paul's Epistles; and from these he expunged all that disagreed with his own theories.^x He did not question the authorship of the other books, but supposed that the writers were themselves blinded by Judaism, and, moreover, that their works had been corrupted in the course of time.^y

Marcion held the existence of three principles—the Supreme God, perfectly good; the devil, or lord of matter, eternal and evil; and between these the Demiurge, a being of limited power and knowledge, whose chief characteristic was a justice unmixed with love or mercy. It is not certain whether the Demiurge was supposed to be an independent existence, or (as in most Gnostic systems) an emanation from the Supreme God; but the latter opinion is the more probable.^z It was taught that the creation of the Supreme was immaterial and invisible; that the Demiurge formed this world and its inhabitants out of substance which he had taken from the material chaos without the consent or knowledge of its ruler. The soul of man was not (as in other systems) supposed to be implanted by the Supreme God, but was the work of the Demiurge, and of a quality answerable to the limited nature of its author; it had no power to withstand the attacks of the material principle, which was represented as always striving to reclaim the portion abstracted from it. Man fell through disobedience to the laws of the Demiurge, and his original nature was changed for the worse.^a The Demiurge chose for himself one nation—the Jews;

thing to the discredit of Marcion, deny the truth of this altogether. Gieseler quotes a passage from the Marcionite Apelles (ap. Euseb. v. 13), which proves that the sect attached little importance to doctrines, and therefore thinks it probable that the founder may have been led to regret his schism as hurtful to the practical interests of Christianity (I. i. 195). Tillemont supposes that the story has been transferred by mistake from Cerdon to Marcion (ii. 274, 609).

^y Matter, ii. 234; Neander, ii. 131-2.

^x Iren. I. xxvii. 2; Tert. adv. Marc. iv. 2, seqq.; Matter, ii. 236, 257-260; Neander, ii. 149; Bishop Kaye on Tertullian, 469.

^y Tert. adv. Marc. iv. 3; Matter, ii. 234.

^z See Iren. I. xxvii. 2; Clem. Alex. Strom. iii. 3, p. 515; Origen. de Princip. ii. 5; Epiph. xlii. 3; Augustin. de Hæres. 22; Neander, ii. 141; Matter, ii. 260-2; Gieseler, I. i. 193.

^a Tert. adv. Marc. i. 22.

to these he gave a law which was not in itself evil, but was fitted only for lower natures, being imperfect in its morality, and destitute of inward spirit. His system was rigorously just; the disobedient he made over to torments, and he rewarded the righteous with rest in "Abraham's bosom."^b

The Demiurge promised a Messiah, his son, and of a nature like his own, who was to come, not for the purpose of mediation and forgiveness, but in order to destroy heathenism and to establish the empire of the Jews. But the Supreme God, in pity for mankind, of whom the vast majority, without any fault of their own, were excluded from all knowledge of the Demiurge, and liable to his condemnation, resolved to send down a higher Messiah, his own son. The world was not prepared for this by any previous revelations; for no such preparation was necessary, as the Messiah's works were of themselves sufficient evidence of his mission. He appeared suddenly in the synagogue of Capernaum, "in the fifteenth year of Tiberius Cæsar;" but in order to obtain a hearing from the Jews, he accommodated himself to their notions, and professed to be that Messiah whom the Demiurge's prophets had taught them to expect.^c Now, for the first time, the true God was revealed, and forgiveness of sins was bestowed on men, with knowledge and strength, in order to overcome the enmity of matter.^d

The Demiurge, ignorant of the Messiah's real nature, but jealous of a power superior to his own, stirred up the Jews against him; the God of matter urged on the Gentiles to join in the persecution, and the Saviour was crucified. Yet according to Marcion's view, his body could not really suffer, inasmuch as it was spiritual and ethereal; his submission to the cross was meant to teach that the sufferings of the worthless body are not to be avoided as evils.^e

Marcion admitted the descent into hell, and with it was connected one of his strangest doctrines—that the heathens, and the reprobates of the Old Testament (such as Cain, Esau, and the men of Sodom), suffering from the vengeance of the Demiurge, gladly hailed the offer of salvation, and were delivered; while the Old Testament saints, being satisfied with the happiness of

^b Ib. iii. 24; Mosh. 404-5; Neander, ii. 142-3.

^c Tertull. adv. Marc. iii. 15; iv. 2, 3, 6, 7; Matter, ii. 246, 267-270.

^d Mosh. 407; Neander, ii. 144-5.

^e Mosh. 407-9; Neander, ii. 145-6; Matter, ii. 279. Marcion's view as to

our Lord's body was peculiar. It could not be material, since matter is evil; but neither was it, as some Gnostics held, a mere phantom; it was a real body, although invisible, and it was clothed with a phantastic outward form.

Abraham's bosom, and suspecting the Saviour's call as a temptation, refused to listen to Him, and were left as before.^f This, however, was not to be their final condition. The Demiurge's Messiah was after all to come; he was to gather the dispersed of Israel out of all lands, to establish an universal empire of the Jews, and to bless the adherents of his father with an earthly happiness; while such of the heathen and of the disobedient as had not been exempted from his power by laying hold on the higher salvation were to be consigned to torments. For the people of the Supreme God, it was taught that the soul will be released from the flesh, and will rise to dwell with Him in a spiritual body.^g

The fundamental difficulty with Marcion was the supposed impossibility of reconciling love with punitive justice; hence his distinction of the Supreme God, all love, and the Demiurge, all severity. In order to carry out this view he wrote a book called *Antitheses*,^h in which, with the intention of showing an essential difference between the Old and the New Testament, he insisted on all such principles and narratives in the elder Scriptures as appeared to be inconsistent with the character of love, and made the most of all the instances in which our Lord had (as Marcion supposed) declared Himself against the Jewish system.ⁱ

Marcion is described as a man of grave disposition and manners.^k The character of his sect was ascetic; he allowed no animal food except fish; he forbade marriage, and required a profession of continence as a condition of baptism.^l Baptism, however, might be deferred; the catechumens were (contrary to the practice of the Church) admitted to witness the celebration of the highest mysteries;^m and if a person died in the state of a catechumen, there was a vicarious baptism for the dead.ⁿ It is said that Marcion allowed baptism to be administered thrice, in the belief that at each time the sins committed since the preceding baptism were remitted; that he celebrated the Eucharist with water; and that, as a mark of opposition to Judaism, he enjoined the observance of the sabbath as a fast.^o

^f Iren. I. xxvii. 3; Epiph. xlii. 4. This bears some likeness to the Cainite doctrine (sup. p. 39), but rests on a different ground.

^g Tertull. adv. Marc. i. 28; iii. 24; Epiph. xlii. 4; Neander, ii. 147; Matter, ii. 267, 283. Marcion denied the resurrection of the body. Tert. i. 24.

^h Tertull. adv. Marc. i. 19.

ⁱ Tertullian (Books ii.-v.) and Epiphanius (xlii. 11) discuss these points at

great length.

^k Mosh. 401.

^l Clem. Alex. Strom. iii. 3, p. 515; Tertull. adv. Marc. i. 29.

^m Tertull. de Præscr. 41; Epiph. xlii. 3.

ⁿ Matter, ii. 286-8. For this 1 Cor. xv. 29 was alleged. Chrys. Hom. xl. in 1 Cor. (p. 507, ed. Field).

^o Epiph. xlii. 3.

The bold rejection of all Jewish and heathen elements, the arbitrary treatment of Holy Scripture, and the apparent severity of the sect, drew many converts.^p Marcion affected to address his followers as “companions in hatred and tribulation :”^q they rather courted than shunned persecution; many suffered as Christians with great constancy, and the sect boasted of its martyrs.^r Marcionism is described by Epiphanius as prevailing widely in his own time (about A.D. 400), nor did it become extinct until the sixth century.^s

Strange and essentially unchristian as Gnosticism was, we must yet not overlook the benefits which Christianity eventually derived from it. Like other heresies, it did good service by engaging the champions of orthodoxy in the investigation and defence of the doctrines which it assailed; but this was not all. In the various forms of Gnosticism, the chief ideas and influences of earlier religions and philosophies were brought into contact with the Gospel—pressing, as it were, for entrance into the Christian system. Thus the Church was forced to consider what in those older systems was true, and what false; and while stedfastly rejecting the falsehood, to appropriate the truth, to hallow it by a combination with the Christian principle, and so to rescue all that was precious from the wreck of a world which was passing away. “It was,” says a late writer,^t “through the Gnostics that studies, literature, and art were introduced into the Church;” and when Gnosticism had accomplished its task of thus influencing the Church, its various forms either ceased to exist, or lingered only as the obsolete creeds of an obscure and diminishing remnant.^u

^p Matter, ii. 289.

^q Tertull. adv. Marc. iv. 9.

^r Tillem. ii. 270. See Bayle, art. *Marcionites*, note E.

^s Epiph. xlii. 1; Matter, ii. 314.

^t Baumgarten - Crusius, ‘Dogmengeschichte,’ quoted by Dorner, i. 357.

^u Dorner, i. 356-7; Neander, ii. 157.

CHAPTER V.

THE REIGNS FROM COMMODUS TO ELAGABALUS.

A.D. 180-222.

ALTHOUGH the writings of the apologists had failed to obtain a legal toleration for the Church, they were not without effect.^a The cause which could find men of ability and learning to advocate it with their pens, took by degrees a new position. The old vulgar calumnies died away; the more enlightened of the heathen began to feel that, if their religion were to withstand the Gospel, it must be reformed, not only in practice but in doctrine. Hence we find in this period attempts, on the part of the philosophers, to claim for their own system some truths to which Christianity had first given prominence, approximations to the Gospel in various ways, and endeavours after a combination of doctrines.

Of the princes who occupied the imperial throne, some reigned but a short time, and have left no traces in the history of the Church. Commodus, the unworthy son of Marcus Aurelius, is said to have been influenced by his favourite concubine, Marcia, to spare the Christians, and to recall many of them from banishment.^b But although this reign was generally a time of repose for the Church, it produced one remarkable martyrdom—that of Apollonius, a Roman senator who was accused of being a Christian by one of his slaves. The informer was put to death by having his legs broken; Apollonius, after having read a defence of his faith before the senate, was beheaded;^c and the case is celebrated as illustrating the supposed condition of the Christians—legally liable to the punishment of death for their belief, yet protected by an enactment which appointed the same penalty for their accusers. It labours, however, under several difficulties; even if the circumstances be admitted as true, there remains a question whether the informer was punished for molesting a Christian, or for violating the duty of slave to master.^d

^a Tzschirner, 351.

^b *Philosophumena*, b. ix. p. 288; Tillen. *Emp.* ii. 481.

^c Euseb. v. 21 (who, however, does not state that the accuser was the slave

of Apollonius, although his words have been so misunderstood); Hieron. *De Viris Illustr.* 42.

^d See Neander, i. 163; Gieseler, I. i. 176.

Severus, in the beginning of his reign, favoured the Church, in consequence, it is said, of a cure which he himself had experienced from having been anointed with oil by a Christian named Proculus Torpacion;^e he kept his deliverer near him, and allowed some persons of rank and authority to profess the Gospel.^f But the laws were still in an unsatisfactory state; the treatment of the Christians still depended on the will of individual governors; nay, those governors who were favourably disposed found it impossible to protect them when accused.^g Before any new edict had appeared, severe persecutions were carried on in various parts of the empire. The rescript of Trajan, which forbade inquiry to be made after the Christians, was neglected; the mob still called for their blood in the amphitheatres; many were tortured, with a view to make them discover their faith; some were burnt; some were condemned to the mines or to banishment; even the graves of the dead were violated.^h In these times a custom arose of purchasing toleration. It was sanctioned by many bishops, who alleged the scriptural example of Jason;ⁱ and the money was paid, not only by way of occasional bribes to accusers or soldiers, but as a rent or tax, like that levied on the followers of some disreputable callings for license to carry on their business.^k The effect was, on the whole, unfavourable to the quiet of the Church, as unscrupulous governors soon learnt the expedient of putting to death a few of the poorer Christians within their jurisdictions, by way of alarming the richer brethren and extorting money from them.^l The severe Marcionites and the enthusiastic Montanists disdained the compromise to which believers in general submitted; they classed together the practice of paying for safety, and that of flight in persecution, as alike unworthy of their profession.^m

In the year 202, Severus issued an edict, forbidding, under heavy penalties, that any of his subjects should embrace Judaism or Christianity.ⁿ Perhaps the extravagances of Montanism may have contributed to provoke this edict,^o as well as the cause which

^e Tertull. ad Scapulam, 4. Some have supposed that Severus was the governor under whom, in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, the martyrdoms of Lyons took place; but there is no good ground for this.

^f His son Caracalla is said to have been "brought up on Christian milk" (Tert. ad Scap. 4), which probably means that he had a Christian nurse. Tillem. Emp. iii. 108.

^g Mosh. 254.

^h Tertull. Apol. 12, 30; Baron. 201. 30-3; Mosh. 254. The Christians may

also have suffered under the law against clubs (see above, p. 11), which was renewed by Severus. Ulpian, in Digest. I. xii. 14; Neander, i. 166.

ⁱ Acts xvii. 9; Baron. 205. 17.

^k Tertull. de Fugâ in Persecutione, 13.

^l Mosh. 453.

^m Baron. 205. 19; Kaye on Tertullian, 140. "Sicut fuga redemptio gratuita est," says Tertullian (De Fugâ, c. 12), "ita redemptio nummaria fuga est."

ⁿ Spartian. Vit. Sev. 17.

^o As is suggested by Gieseler, I. i. 257.

is more commonly assigned for it—the refusal of the Christians to share in the rejoicings which welcomed the emperor's triumphant return to Rome.^p That refusal was really grounded, not on any political disaffection, but on a religious objection to the heathen rites and indecencies which were mixed with such celebrations;^q for, whatever might have been the private feelings of Christians during the late contest for the empire, they had abstained from taking part with any of the competitors, nor is it recorded that there were any Christians among those adherents of Niger and Albinus who suffered from the vengeance of Severus.^r

Although the new edict did not expressly forbid Christians to exercise their religion, but only to increase their numbers by proselytism,^s it had the effect of stimulating their enemies to persecution, which was carried on with great severity in Egypt and Proconsular Africa, although it does not appear to have extended to other provinces.^t

Of the African martyrs, the most celebrated are Perpetua and her companions, whose sufferings are related in a narrative partly written by Perpetua herself.^u She was a catechumen, noble and wealthy, of the age of twenty-two, married or lately left a widow,^x and with an infant at her breast. After her arrest she was visited by her father, a heathen, who urged her to disavow her faith. She asked him whether a vessel which stood near could be called by any other than its proper name; and on his answering that it could not, "Neither," said she, "can I call myself other than what I am—a Christian." The father was violently enraged, and it seemed as if he would have done her some bodily harm; he departed, however, and did not return for some days.

During the interval Perpetua was baptized, with her companions Revocatus, Felicitas, Saturninus, and Secundulus; the Spirit, she says, moved her to pray at her baptism for the power of endurance. They were then removed to a place of stricter confinement than that

^p Baron. 200. 4; Tillem. iii. 118.

^q Tertull. Apol. 35.

^r Ibid.; Neander's Antignosticus, 53-4; Milman, ii. 206.

^s Mosh. 455. Neander points out (i. 167) that a great difference may have been made in the operation of the edict between Jews—professors of an ancient national religion—and Christians, who might all have been considered as proselytes. But, without some proof that it actually was so, we may hesitate to admit the distinction. It must have been known that in very many cases

Christianity was, although not a national or legalised, yet an inherited religion; and, as it had existed at Rome in the days of Nero, it could no longer be regarded as a novelty in the year 202.

^t Euseb. vi. 1, 4, 5; Neander, i. 167; Milman, ii. 208.

^u Printed in the third volume of Migne's Patrologia. The date is variously fixed from 203 to 206. Tillem. iii. 138.

^x As her husband does not appear in the story, it is conjectured that he may have been dead. Ibid. 139.

to which they had at first been committed ; and Perpetua suffered from the heat, the darkness, the crowd, and the insults of the soldiers, but most of all from anxiety for her infant. Two deacons, by giving money to the gaolers, procured leave for the Christians to spend some hours of each day in a more open part of the prison. There Perpetua's child was brought to her by her mother and brother, and after a time she was able to keep him wholly with her ; whereupon she felt herself relieved from all uneasiness, so that, she says, "the prison all at once became like a palace to me, and I would rather have been there than anywhere else."

Her brother, a catechumen, now told her that she might venture to pray for a vision, for the purpose of ascertaining how the imprisonment was to end.^y She prayed accordingly, and saw a ladder of gold, reaching up to heaven, so narrow that only one person at a time could ascend its steps. Around it were swords, lances, and hooks, ready to pierce and tear the flesh of such as should attempt to climb without due caution ; while a great dragon lay at the foot, endeavouring to deter from the ascent. Saturus—an eminent Christian, who afterwards surrendered himself, and became the companion of the sufferers—was the first to go up the ladder, and, on reaching the top, invited Perpetua to follow. By the name of Christ she quelled the dragon, and when she had put her foot on the first step of the ladder, she trod on the monster's head. Above, she found herself in a spacious garden, where she saw a shepherd, with white hair, milking his ewes, with thousands of forms in white garments around him. He welcomed her, and gave her a morsel of cheese, which she received with joined hands and ate, while the white-robed company said Amen. At this sound she awoke, but a sweet taste still remained in her mouth. The vision was interpreted as a warning that the prisoners must no longer have hope in this world.

Hearing that they were about to be examined, Perpetua's father again visited her. Instead of *daughter* he called her *lady*;^z he kissed her hands, threw himself at her feet, and implored her,—by the remembrance of his long care for her, and of the preference which he had shown her above his other children,—by the grief of her family,—by pity for her child, who could not live without

^y "This," says Dean Milman, "is the language of Montanism; but the vision is exactly that which might haunt the slumbers of the Christian in a high state of religious enthusiasm; it showed

merely the familiar images of the faith, arranging themselves into form." (ii. 219.)

^z "Dominam," Acta, 2.

her—to spare him and all her kindred the sorrow and shame which would follow from her persisting in her profession. The old man's agitation deeply affected her, but she could only reply that all was in God's hands.

On the day of trial, the prisoners were conveyed to the forum,^a and, as Perpetua was brought forward, her father appeared immediately below her, with her infant in his arms, beseeching her to have compassion on the child. The procurator endeavoured to move her by consideration for her offspring, and for her parent's grey hair; but she stedfastly refused to sacrifice. The procurator then ordered her father—who probably disturbed the proceedings by his importunities—to be dislodged from the place where he stood and to be beaten with rods; Perpetua declares that she felt the blows as if they had been inflicted on herself. The accused were condemned to the beasts, and returned to prison rejoicing.

A few days later, as Perpetua was praying, she found herself naming her brother Dinocrates, who had died at the age of seven, and, as she had not thought of him, she felt this as a Divine intimation that she should pray for him. The boy appeared as if coming forth from a dark place,—pale, dirty, showing in his face the cancer which had caused his death, thirsty, but unable to reach some water which he wished to drink. She persevered in prayer for him, and at length was comforted by a vision in which the place around him was light, his person and dress clean, the sore in his face healed into a scar, and the water within his reach. He drank and went away as if to play; “then,” says Perpetua, “I understood that he was translated from punishment.”^b

The narrative goes on to relate another visit of the agonised father, and visions of triumph by which Perpetua was animated for the endurance of her sufferings. Saturus also had a vision of the heavenly glory, moulded on the representations of the Apocalypse; and this was made the means of conveying some admonitions to the bishop, Optatus.

^a It is a question whether the scene was Carthage or Tuburbium.

^b “This,” says Dean Milman, “is evidently a kind of purgatory” (ii. 221); and the passage is used in argument by Romish controversialists. Some in early times, assuming that Dinocrates was unbaptised, inferred that persons so dying might be benefited by the prayers of the survivors; St. Augustine answers (1), That the acts of Perpetua are not canonical; (2), that since they do not describe Dinocrates as unbaptised, he

probably had been baptised, and his sufferings were on account of apostasy committed at his father's instance, or of other sins subsequent to baptism. Augustine seems to place little reliance on the authority of the acts, although Ruinart, in reporting him, mentions only the second plea—which, from the father's heathenism, and from Perpetua's having been only a catechumen at the time of her arrest, seems very improbable. Aug. de Anima, i. 10; iii. 9. Ruin. in Patrol. iii. 38.

The martyrs were kept for the birthday of Geta, who had been associated by his father as a colleague in the empire. Secundulus died in prison. Felicitas, a married woman of servile condition, was in the eighth month of her pregnancy, and both she and her companions feared that her death might be deferred on this account. They therefore joined in prayer; and three days before that of the celebration, Felicitas gave birth to a child. The cries which she uttered in the pangs of travail induced an attendant of the prison to ask her, "If you cannot bear this, what will you do when exposed to the beasts?" "It is I," she answered, "that bear my present sufferings; but then there will be One within me to suffer for me, because I too shall suffer for Him." The child was adopted by a Christian woman.

The gaoler, Pudens, was converted by the behaviour of his prisoners. On the eve of their suffering they were regaled according to custom with the "Free Supper"—a meal at which condemned persons were allowed to behave with all manner of license;^c but, instead of indulging in the usual disorders, they converted it into the likeness of a Christian love-feast. Satorus sternly rebuked the people who pressed to look at them: "Mark our faces well," he said, "that you may know us again in the day of judgment."

When led forth into the amphitheatre, the martyrs wore a joyful look. According to a custom which seems to have been peculiar to Carthage, and derived from the times when human sacrifices were offered under its old Phœnician religion,^d the men were required to put on scarlet dresses, like the priests of Saturn, and the women yellow, like the priestesses of Ceres; but they refused to submit, saying that they suffered in order to be exempt from such compliances, and the justice of the objection was admitted. Perpetua sang psalms; Satorus and others denounced God's vengeance on the procurator and the crowd.

The male victims were exposed to lions, bears, and leopards; the women were tossed by a furious cow. Perpetua appeared as if in a trance, insensible to the pain; on recovering her consciousness, she asked when the beasts would come, and could hardly be convinced that that part of her sufferings was over. Instead of allowing the victims to be privately despatched, as was usual, the spectators demanded that they should be led forth to death; they bade farewell to each other with the kiss of peace, and walked into the midst of the amphitheatre, where their earthly trials were

^c Tillem. iii. 153-4.

^d Neander, i. 172.

soon ended. The gladiator who was to kill Perpetua was an inexperienced youth, and misdirected his sword, on which, observing his agitation, she with her own hand guided it to a mortal part. "Perhaps," says the writer of the Acts, "so great a woman—one who was feared by the unclean spirit—could not have been put to death except by her own will."

The document which has been here abridged bears throughout the stamp of circumstantial truth. Grounds have been found, both in the incidents and in the tone, for an opinion that the martyrs and their historian were Montanists; while the reception of the Acts by the ancient Church tells strongly on the other side. We may, therefore, either suppose that the Montanistic opinions had not produced a formal rupture in the church of Carthage at the time when the Acts were written;^e or we may refer the peculiarities of the story, not to Montanistic principles, but to that natural temperament which rendered Africa a soil especially favourable for the reception of Montanism.^f

Under Caracalla and Elagabalus, the Christians were exempt from persecution. It is said that Elagabalus, in his desire to make all the old national religions subservient to the Syrian worship of which he had been the priest, intended to combine the symbols of Judaism and Christianity with the gods of Greece and Rome, in the temple which he erected to the sun;^g but his career of insane depravity was cut short before he had attempted to carry out this design.

The first subject to be noticed in the internal history of the Church is a violent dispute which arose from a revival of the Paschal question. The difference of observance as to the time of Easter between the churches of Asia Minor and those of other countries has already been mentioned, as also the compromise which was agreed on between Polycarp, as representative of the Asiatics, and Anicetus bishop of Rome.^h It would seem that, for some time after that agreement, Asiatics sojourning at Rome were allowed to follow the usage of their own country, until Soter, who held the see from 168 to 173, required them to conform to the local custom, but without considering Quartodecimanism as a bar

^e This is the solution offered by Gieseler, who considers the Montanism unquestionable. (I. i. 290.)

^f See on the question Tillem. iii. 138; Ruinart, in Patrol. iii. 13; Schröckh, iii. 316; Milman, ii. 216. The Romish writers are concerned to maintain the

catholicity of Perpetua and Felicitas, because they are commemorated in the canon of the mass.

^g Lampridius, Vita Heliogab. 3, 6; Gibbon, i. 153-4.

^h P. 30.

to communion with other churches.ⁱ His second successor, Victor, adopted a different policy.^k One Blastus, an Asiatic, who had repaired to Rome, insisted on the observance of the quartodeciman practice; and about the same time it became suspicious as a token of Montanism, with which, indeed, Blastus appears to have been infected.^l These circumstances might very reasonably have induced Victor to use his influence for the establishment of uniformity throughout the whole Church; but he erred grievously in the manner of his attempt. Councils were held, apparently by his desire, in countries widely distant from each other—in Palestine, Pontus, Osrhoëne, Greece, and Gaul; all these gave evidence that the practice of their own churches agreed with that of the Roman, and were favourable to the wishes of Victor.^m The Asiatics, however, in their council, refused to depart from their traditional rule. Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, a man of eminent place and high personal authority,ⁿ wrote to Victor in behalf of his brethren: he refers to the Apostles St. Peter and St. John, with other venerable personages who had adorned the church of Asia, as having sanctioned the quartodeciman usage; and he declares himself resolved to abide by it, as apostolical in its origin, and nowhere condemned in Scripture, without fearing Victor's threats of breaking off communion with him.^o Victor then, in an imperious letter, cut off the Asiatics from the communion of Rome; and he endeavoured to procure a like condemnation of them from the other branches of the Church. In this, however, he was disappointed. The idea of excluding so large a body from Christian communion shocked the general feeling; many bishops sharply remonstrated with Victor, and exhorted him to desist.^p

Of those who attempted to mediate in the dispute, the most prominent was Irenæus, bishop of Lyons. He was a native of Asia Minor, and in his youth had known the revered St. Polycarp,^q of whom in one of his writings^r he has preserved some interesting recollections. Having joined the missionary church of Lyons, he was chosen by the martyrs under Marcus Aurelius to be the bearer of a letter to the Bishop of Rome, in which they endeavoured to

ⁱ Tillem. iii. 103. Neander, however (i. 414), says that he has given up his former inference from the letter of Irenæus to Victor (Euseb. v. 24), that Soter made a change even to this extent.

^k The controversy is dated from 196 to 198. Tillem. iii. 104; Gieseler, I. i. 293; Burton, ii. 215; Clinton, A.D. 197.

^l The Asiatic Montanists were Quar-

terdecimans, although it does not appear that the sect observed the same practice elsewhere. Baron. 198. 15-6; Gieseler, I. i. 292.

^m Euseb. v. 23.

ⁿ Tillem. iii. 107.

^o Euseb. v. 24.

^p Ibid.

^q Iren. III. iii. 4.

^r The epistle to Florinus, of which a fragment is preserved by Eusebius, v. 20.

allay the heats of the Montanistic controversy; and it appears that during his absence he was elected bishop in the room of Pothinus.^s His reputation for learning and ability had already been established by the great work which is our chief source of information as to the Gnostic heresies; and, connected as he was with both the east and the west,—a Quartodeciman by early association, but a follower of the Roman usage in his own church^t—he was well qualified to exert himself with effect in the character of a peacemaker.^u He wrote in the name of his church, exhorting Victor to moderation, referring to the conduct of Anicetus and other bishops of Rome, and urging that such a question ought not to be made a ground for a breach of communion, inasmuch as a diversity of usages had always been allowed, and such variations in indifferent things served to confirm the argument which might be drawn from the agreement of all churches as to the essentials of the faith.^v

Peace was at length restored. The Asiatics, in a circular letter, cleared themselves from all suspicion of heretical tendencies, and were allowed to retain their usage until the time of the Council of Nicæa.^w

It is hardly necessary to observe that the attempt^x to press this affair into the service of the later papal claims is singularly unfortunate. Victor's behaviour, indeed, may be considered as foreshadowing that of his successors in the fullness of their pride: but his pretensions were far short of theirs; the assembling of the councils, although it took place at his request, was the free act of the local bishops;^y he was unceremoniously rebuked for his measures; there is no token of deference to him as a superior; and his designs were utterly foiled.^z

On proceeding to examine the heresies of the period, we find them different in character from those which we have hitherto met with. The fundamental question of Gnosticism was that as to the

^s Euseb. v. 3-4; Beaven on Irenæus, 11-5.

^t This has been regarded as a proof that the Gospel was planted in the south of France before the arrival of Pothinus from Asia. (Burton, ii. 217.) Yet it is possible that Asiatic missionaries, on settling in a western country, may have adopted the common practice of the West, although they were the first to occupy their particular ground.

^u Euseb. v. 24, who notices the agreement between the name of Irenæus (*Peaceful*) and his labours in the cause

of peace.

^v Iren. Fragm. *ibid.*

^w Tillem. iii. 111; Mosh. 445. The Council of Arles, however, in 314, ordered that Easter should everywhere be celebrated "on one day, and at one time." Can. 1.

^x Baronius, A.D. 198. Tillemont candidly says that the cardinal's assertions would be hard to prove. iii. 108.

^y See Tillem. iii. 104.

^z Basnage, vii. 5, 6 (t. i. 361); Planck, i. 119; Ellendorf, *Der Primat der röm. Päpste*, i. 115-8.

origin of evil; the error consisted in attempting to solve this by theories which were chiefly derived from some other source than the Christian revelation. But the newer heresies come more within the sphere of Christian ideas. On the one hand, there is the practical, ascetic, enthusiastic sect of Montanus; on the other hand, speculation takes the form of an endeavour to investigate and define the Scriptural doctrines as to the Saviour and the Godhead.

The origin of Montanism was earlier than the time at which we have arrived. By one writer^a it is placed as far back as the year 126; by Eusebius^b in 173; by others about 150.^c The founder, a native of Mysia, had been a heathen, and probably a priest of Cybele.^d Soon after his conversion he began to fall into fits of ecstasy, and to utter ravings which were dignified with the name of prophecy. Two women of wealth and station, Maximilla and Priscilla, forsook their husbands, and became prophetesses in connexion with him.^e The utterances of Montanus and his companions aimed at the introduction of a more rigid system than that which had before prevailed in the Church; they added to the established fasts both in number and in severity; they classed second marriages as equal in guilt with adultery; they proscribed military service and secular life in general; they denounced alike profane learning, the vanities of female dress, and amusements of every kind; they laid down severe precepts as to penance—declaring that the Church had no power to remit sin after baptism, although they claimed such power for the Montanistic prophets; and that some sins excluded for ever from the communion of the saints on earth, although it was not denied that the mercy of God might be extended to them.^f

The progress of the sect did not depend on the character or abilities of its founder who seems to have been a man of weak and disordered mind.^g In the region of its birth it was congenial to the character of the people, as appears from the prevalence of

^a Baratier.

^b Euseb. Chron. ap. Hieron. t. viii. 630. Tillemont (ii. 667), and Mr. Clinton (A.D. 173) agree with him. Péttau (quoted by Pearson, Minor Works, ii. 500) gives the still later date of 179.

^c Apollonius, the oldest authority, writing under Commodus, places the origin about forty years before (ap. Euseb. H. E. v. 18); Epiphanius (xlviii. 1) says it was about the 19th year of Antoninus Pius (A.D. 148). See too Mosh. 412; Schröckh, iii. 61; Burton, ii. 155;

Gieseler, I. i. 196; Neander, ii. 206.

^d This is inferred from his being styled an eunuch (Hieron. Ep. xli. 4) and “a priest of an idol.” (Didym. de Trinit. iii. 41, p. 449, ed. Mingarell. Bonon. 1769.) Schwegler, one of the new Tübingen school, supposes him to be mythical! Gieseler, I. ii. 196.

^e Euseb. v. 14, 16, 18.

^f Epiph. xlviii. 4; Tillem. ii. 433; Mosh. 414-420; Kaye on Tertullian, 394-5; Neander, ii. 218.

^g Mosh. 410-2; Kaye, 30.

the wild worship of Bacchus and Cybele among the Phrygians in earlier times.^h Persecution tended to stimulate the imagination of the prophets, to exasperate them to fierceness, and to win a ready reception for their oracles.ⁱ And on penetrating into other countries, Montanism found multitudes already prepared for it by their tempers of mind; so that its work was nothing more than to draw these out into exercise. It held out attractions to the more rigid feelings by setting forth the idea of a life stricter than that of ordinary Christians; to weakness, by offering the guidance of precise rules where the Gospel had contented itself with laying down general principles; to enthusiasm and the love of excitement, by its pretensions to prophetic gifts; to pride, by professing to realize the pure and spotless mystical Church in an exactly defined visible communion, and by encouraging its proselytes to regard themselves as spiritual (*spirituales*), and all other Christians as carnal (*carnales, psychici*).^k

Montanus has been charged with styling himself the Paraclete, and even with claiming to be the Almighty Father.^l The latter charge is founded on the circumstance that he delivered his oracles in the person of the Father, of Whom, however, he only pretended to be the organ. Nor did he really assert himself to be the Holy Ghost, or Paraclete: but he taught that the promise of the Comforter was not limited to the Apostles; that, having been imperfectly performed in them, it was now more fully realised in himself and his associates.^m The progress of revelation was illustrated by the development of man; Judaism had been as infancy; the dispensation of the New Testament as youth; that of the Paraclete was maturity.ⁿ The new revelation, however, was limited to the advancement of institutions and discipline; it did not interfere with the traditional faith of Christians, but confirmed it.^o

The Montanists held that the mind, under the prophetic influence, was to be merely passive, while the Spirit swept over it "as the plectrum over the lyre."^p This comparison had been

^h Neander, ii. 204; Milman, ii. 213.

ⁱ Neander, ii. 206.

^k Neander, Antignost. 6; Ch. Hist. ii. 200, 204, 219-20.

^l Epiph. xlviii. 11.

^m Tillem. ii. 431; Mosh. 413; Kaye on Tertull. 21-6; Neander, ii. 210; Milman, ii. 214; Blunt on the Fathers, 610-1.

ⁿ Tertull. de Virg. velandis, c. 1.

^o Neander, ii. 210-1; Gieseler, I. i.

197. The prophetesses had visions which were alleged as confirming the doctrine of the resurrection in opposition to the Gnostics. (Mosh. 415.) But some of the later Montanists are charged with denying the distinction of persons in the Godhead. Theodoret, Hær. iii. 2.

^p Epiph. xlviii. 4. Although in many points—as in that mentioned in the preceding note—Montanism irresistibly reminds us of the modern magnetic pre-

applied by Justin Martyr to the inspiration of the Scripture prophets;¹ but the idea was now combated by the opponents of Montanism, some of whom maintained that the prophets of Scripture not only retained their human consciousness, but clearly understood the fulfilment of what they foretold.² Soon after the origin of the sect some bishops wished to try the effect of exorcism on the prophetesses; but the Montanists would not allow the experiment.³

On his ejection from the Church, Montanus organised a body of preachers, who were maintained by the oblations of his followers, and, notwithstanding the professed austerity of the sect, are broadly charged by its opponents with hypocrisy, covetousness, and luxury.⁴ The order of bishops was only the third in the Montanistic hierarchy—patriarchs and *cenones*⁵ being superior to it. The patriarch resided at Pepuza, a small town or village in Phrygia, to which the sectaries gave the mystical name of Jerusalem, as believing that it would be the seat of the millennial kingdom, which was a chief subject of their hopes. Hence they derived the names of Pepuzians and Cataphrygians.⁶

It is said, although not without doubt, by one ancient writer, that both Montanus and Maximilla ended their lives by hanging themselves, about forty years after the origin of their sect;⁷ a story which, if it were true, would rather prove that they were the victims of a diseased melancholy than warrant the conclusions against their morality which have been drawn from it.⁸ Maximilla had declared that no prophetess would arise after her, but that the end of all things would immediately come;⁹ yet we find that other women of excitable temperament pretended to the prophetic character. The case of one, who is spoken of by Tertullian as falling into trances, in which she was consulted for revelations as to the unseen world, and for medical prescriptions, bears a remarkable likeness to some narratives of our own day.¹⁰

tensions, Baron Bunsen's conjecture (Hippolytus, i. 384), that Montanus meant by this to speak of *himself* (as the Paraclete) performing magnetic operations, appears too ingenious.

¹ Cohort. ad Græcos, 8; cf. Apol. i. 36.

² Epiph. xlviii. 3, 8. See John Smith's 'Select Discourses,' 213-4, ed. Lond. 1821, and Newman in St. Athanasius against the Arians, p. 467, note i.

³ Euseb. v. 16, 18.

⁴ Apollonius ap. Euseb. v. 18; Tillem. ii. 426-8.

⁵ Hieron. Ep. xli. 3. Neither the

editors of St. Jerome nor the historians profess to explain this word.

⁶ Euseb. v. 18; Epiph. xlviii. 14; Theodoret, Hær. iii. 2.

⁷ Anon. ap. Euseb. v. 16. Comp. Tillem. ii. 427, 447.

⁸ Schröckh, iii. 61, 67.

⁹ Epiph. xlviii. 2. The anonymous writer cited by Eusebius, v. 16, says that Maximilla had been dead fourteen years, yet no other prophetess had arisen.

¹⁰ Tert. de Anima, c. 9; Gieseler, I. i. 197; Colquhoun's Isis Revelata, ed. 2. ii. 22.

In the west Montanism was at first well received. It engaged the attention of the Lyonese martyrs during their imprisonment, and they wrote both to the Asiatic Churches, and to Eleutherius, bishop of Rome,—not recognising the pretensions of the sect, but advising that it should be gently dealt with.^d It benefited by the extravagance of some opponents, who, in their zeal to oppose the inferences drawn from St. John's writings, both as to the promise of the Comforter and as to the millennial kingdom, denied the authority of those writings, and ascribed them to the heretic Cerinthus;^e and the impression made by this extravagance in the west was increased by the circumstance that the Montanists were condemned by the Asiatic church at the very time when it was embroiled with the Roman on the Paschal controversy.^f Victor was on the point of formally recognising them, when an Asiatic named Praxeas, armed with the authority which was attached to the character of a confessor, arrived at Rome, and, by his reports as to the nature of the party, induced the bishop to change his opinion, and excommunicate them.^g

The Montanists loudly complained of it as a wrong that they were excluded from the Church while they wished to remain in communion with it. Their complaint, however, is only an instance of the usual inability of partisans to view their own case fairly. By the rigour of its discipline, by the contempt with which its professors looked down on the great body of Christians, by enforcing its peculiarities under the sanction of a pretended revelation, Montanism had before virtually excommunicated the Church; and we cannot doubt that, if tolerated, it would not have been content with anything short of supremacy.^h Moreover, its spirit was strongly opposed to the regular authority of the Church. The ordinary offices it disparaged as merely psychic; bishops were inferior to prophets; and prophets were distinguished, not by outward ordination, but by spiritual gifts and graces, so that they might belong to any class.ⁱ Nor can we wonder if the attitude which the Montanists assumed towards the state had a share in

^d Sup. p. 72; Euseb. v. 3.

^e Epiph. li. 3. These were styled *Alogi*—a name of double meaning—signifying their rejection of the writings in which the *Logos* is mentioned, and also that they were *without reason*.

^f Tillem. ii. 424.

^g It is generally supposed that Victor was the bishop of Rome of whom this is related by Tertullian (adv. Prax. c. 1). See Gieseler, I. i. 286-7, who gives 192

as the date. Neander, however, places the incident under Anicetus (ii. 206); and Bishop Pearson (Min. Works, ii. 501), who is followed by Dr. Beaven (12-3), connects it with the application of the Lyonese martyrs to Eleutherius. See Wordsworth's 'St. Hippolytus,' 131.

^h Mosh. 415, 419, 420, 422-3; Schröckh, iii. 70; Neander, ii. 220.

ⁱ Neander, ii. 212.

inducing the more peaceable Christians to disconnect themselves from them; for their prophecies in great part consisted of matter which, by the Roman law, amounted to treason,—denunciations of calamity, and exultation over the approaching downfall of the persecuting empire.^k

The stern spirit of the sect animated its members to court persecution. Their zeal for martyrdom was nourished by the doctrine that the souls of martyrs would enter at once into the enjoyment of their full blessedness, whereas those of other righteous men would not receive their consummation until the end of the world. The Montanists were, however, preserved by their rigid views on the subject of penance from admitting the abuses which arose elsewhere as to the privilege of martyrs in granting indulgences.^l

Although the sect and its subdivisions continued to flourish for a time, and some remains of it existed in the sixth century, or even later,^m the chief success of Montanism was gained in a different way—by infusing much of its character into the Church.ⁿ It is probably to its congeniality with the spirit which afterwards became dominant in the west that Montanism owes the privilege which it alone, of the early heresies, possesses—that of being allowed to descend to us in the unmutilated representations of one of its advocates.^o

Tertullian was perhaps the most eminent man whom the Church had seen since the days of the apostles. Of his character we have a full and distinct impression from the evidence of his own works; but the facts of his life are very obscure.^p He was a native of Carthage, son of a centurion, and is supposed to have been born about the year 160.^q We learn from himself that he was originally a heathen, and that as such he partook in the prevailing vices of his countrymen.^r That he had followed

^k Mosh. 411, 423; Schröckh, iii. 67; Gieseler, I. i. 197.

^l Neander, ii. 219. See below, C. VI. sect. iii.

^m Tillem. ii. 444; Mosh. 415. Theophanes speaks of some Montanists as persecuted by Leo the Isaurian, A.D. 723 (p. 617); but it is questioned whether these were of the ancient sect so called. See vol. II. book iii. c. 4.

ⁿ The most distinguished late champion of Romanism does not hesitate to describe Montanism as an anticipation of the mediæval system. (Newman on Development, 350-1). Prof. Archer Butler remarks that this writer “cen-

sures Tertullian solely, it would seem, for having arrived at perfection too soon—for having ambitiously presumed to be a mediæval saint before his time; perfect excellence in the tenth century being palpable heresy in the second.” Letters on Development, p. 82. Comp. Neander, ii. 213, and Antignost. 113; Gieseler, i. 290; Rettberg, Cyprianus, 17. ^o Daillé De Usu Patrum, pp. 5-6, ed. Genev. 1656. Tertullian's treatise on prophetic ecstasy is, however, lost. Kaye, 6-7.

^p Kaye on Tertullian, 12, 37-8.

^q Tillem. iii. 196.

^r Apol. 18; De Pœnit. 1; De Resurr.

the profession of an advocate appears probable, no less from his style of argument than from his acquaintance with law, and from his use of forensic terms.^s In addition to his legal learning, he shows a knowledge of physic and natural philosophy, with extensive reading in poetry and general literature; and he was master of the Greek language to such a degree as to compose treatises in it.^t

After his conversion he became a presbyter of the Church, and in that character resided both at Carthage and at Rome.^u His lapse into Montanism, which took place in middle life,^x is ascribed by St. Jerome^y to the jealousy and slights which he met with at the hands of the Roman clergy; but, although it is very possible that Tertullian may have been treated by these in a manner which exasperated his impatient temper,^z the assigned motive has been generally discredited, and is, indeed, needless in order to account for his having joined a party whose opinions and practice accorded so well with his natural bent.^a We must be prepared to see frequently in the course of our history men of high gifts forsake the orthodox communion—led astray either by a restless spirit of speculation, or by a desire to realize the vision of a faultless Church in a manner which Holy Scripture appears to represent as unattainable.^b

Not only are the dates of the events in Tertullian's life, and of his writings, uncertain, but it is impossible to decide whether certain of his treatises were written before or after his defection. On the one hand, the subject of a work belonging to his Montanistic period may be such as to allow no room for displaying the peculiarities of his sect; on the other hand, a severity of tone, which seems like a token of Montanism, may be merely the result of the writer's temperament, or characteristic of the more rigid party within the Church.^c The genius of Tertullian is gloomy and saturnine; the spirit of the Gospel appears in him strongly tinged by the nature of the man.^d He has a remarkable power of forcible

Carnis, 59; Neander, Antignost. 9; Evans, i. 331.

^s Tillem. iii. 198; Neand. Antign. 8-9.

^t He himself alludes to these (De Baptismo, 15; De Virg. veland. 1; De Corona, 6).

^u Tillem. iii. 198; 654-5. See Kaye, 10.

^x Dr. Pusey dates his conversion in 196, and his lapse in 204. (Tert. Oxf. Transl. p. ii.) Cave's dates are respectively 185 and 199. Hist. Lit. i. 56-7.

^y De VV. Illustr. c. 53.

^z Kaye, 33-4. See Cave, Hist. Lit. i. 57. Tertullian's consciousness of his defects in temper appears from De Patientia, c. 1.

^a Neander, Antign. 11, 14.

^b See Vincent. Lirin. Commonit. 17-8. Dr. Pusey, while he blames Tertullian for his secession, appears to rest the defence of the Church on somewhat ideal grounds, vii. seqq.

^c Kaye, 40-1.

^d Neand. Antign. 9-10.

argument and condensed expression; subtlety, acuteness, and depth; a wit alike pungent and delicate; an ardour which carries him over all obstacles, and almost hurries the reader along with him: but his mind is merely that of an advocate, wholly wanting in calmness, solidity, and the power of dispassionate judgment. His language is rude and uncouth, obscured by antiquated^e and newly-coined words, by harsh constructions, and perplexing allusions; his style, both of thought and of expression, is marked by tumour and exaggeration.”^f In another respect Tertullian’s diction is very remarkable and important, as being the earliest specimen of ecclesiastical Latin. Hitherto the language of the Western churches, not only in the Greek colonies of Gaul, but at Rome itself, had been Greek—the general medium of communication, and the tongue in which the oracles of Christianity were written. If Minucius Felix was older than Tertullian,^g the subject of his treatise was not such as to require the use of any especially theological terms; it is therefore to the great African writer that the creation of a technical Christian Latinity is to be ascribed.^h

Tertullian’s *Apology* was almost certainly composed before his lapse,ⁱ and is the masterpiece of the class to which it belongs.^k In it he urges with his characteristic force, and with all the freshness of novelty, most of the topics which had been advanced by the earlier apologists; he adds many new arguments, both in favour of the Gospel and in refutation of Paganism; and he supplies to readers of later times much curious information as to the history and circumstances of the Church. He felt himself entitled to insist on the progress of Christianity as an argument in its favour:—“We are a people of yesterday,” he says, “and yet we have filled every place belonging to you—cities, islands, castles, towns, assemblies, your very camp, your tribes, companies, palace, senate, forum. We leave you your temples only. We can count your armies; our numbers in a single province will be greater.”^l The manner in which he meets the charges of disloyalty against his

^e Neander quotes the high authority of Niebuhr for the opinion that Tertullian’s provincialisms are not (as has sometimes been said) Punic, but purely Latin archaisms. *Antignost.* 13.

^f Dupin, i. 104; Mosh. 222–3; Schröckh, iii. 322; Neander, ii. 443; Münter, *Primordia Eccl. Afric.* 131–2; Bähr, ii. 34–7; Pusey, *Introd.* ix.; Blunt on the Fathers, 176.

^g See p. 34, n. f.

^h See Münter, 133; Gieseler, I. 207;

vi. 56; and especially Milman, *Latin Christianity*, i. 27–30.

ⁱ It is generally referred to A.D. 197 or 198. (Tillem. iii. 661; Gieseler, i. 257; Mosh. ap. Migne, *Patrol.* i. 535; Pusey, 1.) Some, however, place it after the edict of Severus—as in 204–5. (Kaye, 40; Pagi in Baron. ii. 393). Allix dates it as late as 217. Kaye, 48.

^k Tzschirner, 385.

^l C. 37. Oxf. Transl. i. 78.

brethren is especially remarkable ; he appeals to the fact (already noticed) that no Christians had been found among the partisans of the emperor's defeated rivals ; and he states as a reason why Christians were bound to pray for the continuance of the empire a belief that *it* was the obstacle which St. Paul had spoken of as "letting" the appearance of Antichrist."^m In a later apologetic writing, the Address to Scapula,ⁿ Tertullian again insists on the loyalty of Christians ; but he declares that the blood of the saints cannot be shed without drawing down vengeance. His tone is full of scorn and defiance ; he exults in the calamities and portents of the time, as signs and foretastes of the ruin which was about to fall on the persecutors.

On joining the Montanists, Tertullian embraced their doctrine in its full rigour. The contempt of a *spiritualis* for the *psychic* Church is uttered with all the vehemence of his character, and with all his power of expression. Although he himself was or had been married, he is violent against matrimony ; to marry two wives in succession he regards as no less an offence than marriage with two at once ; he would exclude *digamists* from the Church, without hope of reconciliation, although he does not deny that God may possibly accept their sincere repentance.^o His views as to penance are of the severest kind ; he denies that the Church can remit deadly sin after baptism, but asserts the power of absolution for the prophets of his sect.^p He altogether condemns military service, as inconsistent with Christian duty, and inseparably mixed up with heathen observances.^q One of his treatises was written in justification of a soldier who had been put to death for refusing to wear a garland on the occasion of a donative distributed in honour of the emperor ; he argues that such use of flowers is a sinful vanity, inasmuch as it is not only heathenish, but contrary to nature.^r In the tract *De Spectaculis*^s he proscribes all attendance at public amusements,

^m C. 32 (2 Thessal. ii. 7).

ⁿ This is of the Montanistic period, and was written in the beginning of Caracalla's reign, when persecution had not yet ceased (about 211). Tillemont, iii. 227, 667; Clinton, A.D. 211.

^o De Monogam. 15; De Pudicitia, 1.

^p De Pud. 21.

^q De Corona, 11. But this opinion does not seem to have been peculiar to his Montanistic days. See De Patientia, 7, s. fin.

^r De Cor. 7-10. That Gibbon is wrong in referring this treatise to the period

before Tertullian became a Montanist, see Kaye, 55. The usual date is about 201, but by some it has been placed as late as the reign of Maximin. Such acts as that of this soldier were condemned by the Church. Baron. 201. 17; Bingham, XIV. iv. 8.

^s Dr. Pusey assigns this to the time before the author's lapse, and supposes it written on the celebration of Severus' victory over Albinus, A.D. 198 (Oxf. Transl. i. 187). Others, as Tillemont (iii. 210), refer it to the secular games, A.D. 204.

and fortifies his denunciations with tales of judgments inflicted on persons who had been present at them.^t He regards flight in persecution as even worse than the abjuration of Christ in the midst of tortures; he thinks that a Christian ought to provoke persecution.^u

Bitter as Tertullian became in his tone towards the communion which he had forsaken, he yet did not, like too many in similar circumstances, devote himself exclusively to the work of injuring it. He continued to be the champion of the Gospel against Paganism and Judaism; in treatises against Marcion, Valentinus, Hermogenes,^x Praxeas, and other heretics, he maintained the common cause of his sect and of the Church. St. Augustine states that in his last years he became the head of a distinct party of "Tertullianists," the remnant of which was recovered to the Church in Augustine's own time, and probably through his exertions.^y

The extravagances which have lately been vented in connexion with the term *Development* must not be allowed to prejudice us against admitting that the doctrine of the Church on the highest subjects has undergone a process for which perhaps no more appropriate name could be found.^z This development was rendered

^t Kaye, xvi.; Neand. Antign. 33.

^u 'De Fugâ in Persecutione.' Another treatise, the *Scorpiace*, is directed against the Gnostic disparagement and evasion of martyrdom.

^x Hermogenes was a painter by profession, and a countryman of Tertullian, who was excited to wrath against him, no less by the practical opposition of Hermogenes to the Montanistic rigour, in the exercise of his art (which included the representation of heathen subjects), and in marrying twice or oftener, than by the heterodoxy of his opinions. (Adv. Hermog. 1.) Like the Gnostics, he referred the origin of evil to matter. God, he argued, must have made the world either (1) of Himself, (2) of nothing, or (3) of something: the first supposition was impossible, because by it the world would have been a part of Himself, and therefore would not have been *made* at all; the second, because, as God both wills to make what is good, and knows how to make it, the existence of evil would be unexplained. He must, therefore, have made the world, including the souls as well as the bodies of men, out of matter; and the defects in creation arise, not from his will, but from the

nature of matter (c. 2). It would seem that Hermogenes did not found a sect, and died in the communion of the Church (Mosh. 432); and, since Tertullian does not charge him with any other errors than those which have been mentioned, some other early writers may perhaps be mistaken in saying that he believed our Lord to have left His body in the sun. (Mosh. 434-5; Neand. ii. 280.) St. Augustine, however, describes him as a Sabellian. (De Hæres. 41.) A passage in Tertullian's tract against him is famous as seeming to deny the eternity of God the Son (c. 3). For a favourable explanation of it see Bull, v. 636, seqq.; Nat. Alex. v. 255; Kaye, 523.

^y Aug. de Hæresibus, 86 (t. viii. 46). See Tillemont, iii. 233; xiii. 277. Neander conjectures that these were merely Montanists, who took their name from the most distinguished of their local chiefs rather than from the Phrygian heresiarch (ii. 445); but it seems unlikely that Augustine should have been mistaken. See Münter, Primordia, 147.

^z See Butler's Letters against Newman, pp. 69, 70, 219-22, 241, seqq., 316.

necessary by the circumstances of the case ; its effect was to bring out into a distinct and scientific form truths which had before been not the less really held, although the minds of men had not been exercised in precisely defining them. Thus we can imagine, for example, that the cardinal verities of our Blessed Lord's Godhead and manhood may have been believed by Christians from the beginning, but that it may have been the work of a later time to attain to the full consciousness of such a belief, to investigate what is the proper meaning of Godhead and what of manhood, and what are the conditions of their union in the one person of the Saviour.^a Where principles of truth have been given, it is a legitimate task for the mind enlightened and sanctified by the promised gifts of the Comforter to draw the proper inferences from them.^b When an opinion new in expression was proposed, it was for Christians to ask themselves more distinctly than before what their belief on the subject had been—whether it agreed or disagreed with that which was now presented to them ; to compare their impressions with those of their brethren ; and in concert with these either to admit the doctrine as sound, or to reject it as contrary to the faith in which they had been trained. Thus it was that truth was drawn forth in its fulness by the assaults of error ; that that which had been a feeling and a conviction came by degrees to be stated in exact and formal dogmas.^c Hence we can understand that the early Christian writers might use much loose and imperfect language on the highest points ; that they might even have a defective apprehension as to the details of doctrine ;^d that they might employ terms which the Church afterwards condemned, and might scruple at terms which the Church afterwards sanctioned ; and yet that their belief was sound in itself, faithfully preserving the tradition of the Apostles, and identical with the creed of the later Church.^e Nor is it any real disparagement to the believers nearest the apostolic age to say that on such matters they were less informed than those who came after them. Their work was not to investigate, but to act. Their worship and their whole Christian life implied the true faith ; their writings are penetrated by the conviction of it :^f but as the men who had known the Apostles or their immediate disciples passed away, a necessity arose of relying

^a Dorner, i. 65, 122.

^b Dorner, i. 108 ; Butler, 55-6 ; Comp. Evagr. i. 11.

^c Vinc. Lirin. 13 ; Joh. Scot. Erig. de Div. Provid. i. 4 (Patrol. cxxii.) ; Dorner, i. 110.

^d Aug. de Catech. Rud. 12 ; Petav. de

Trin. Præf. iii. 7 ; vi. Blunt on the Fathers, pp. 160, seqq., 219, and Ser. ii. Lect. 10.

^e Philalethes Cantabrigiensis (Bishop Kaye) in British Magazine, iv. 405-6 ; Dorner, i. 449.

^f Dorner, i. 275.

less on apostolic tradition, and having recourse in a greater degree to the apostolic writings. By the help of these the faith was now to be tested, confirmed, and systematised.^g

In the last years of the second century the difficulty of reconciling the fundamental doctrine of the Divine Unity (*Monarchia*) with that of the Threefold Name gave rise to two different forms of heresy.^h In the one, the unity was rescued by denying the Godhead of the Second and Third Persons; in the other, the names of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost were explained as merely denoting three different manifestations or aspects of one and the same Divine Person.

The leader in the former error was Theodotus, a native of Byzantium, who, although by trade a currier, is described as a man of learning and accomplishment. After having denied Christ in a time of persecution, when the brethren who had been arrested with him suffered martyrdom, he repaired to Rome, where at first he was well received; and when the history of his lapse became known, he excused himself by saying that he had denied not God, but man.ⁱ Thus he was led into his heresy, which seems to have admitted the miraculous conception of our Lord, but regarded Him as nothing more than a man guided by a Divine influence.^k Similar opinions were soon after professed by Artemon, who appears to have been unconnected with Theodotus, but was popularly classed with him.^l Artemon pretended that his doctrine was not only scriptural but primitive—that it had been held in the Church of Rome until the time of Zephyrinus, whose episcopate began in the year 202. It was not difficult to refute such a pretence by a reference to Scripture, to the hymns and liturgical forms of the Church, to the writings of the earlier fathers, and to the fact that on account of a like doctrine Theodotus had been excommunicated by Victor.^m The Artemonites are described

^g Dorner, i. 132, 409.

^h Novatian. *De Trin.* c. 30 (*Patrol.* iii.); Origen in *Joh. t. ii.* 2; Neander, ii. 293; Dorner, i. 497.

ⁱ Epiphanius, liv. 2.

^k Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 53-4; Schröckh, iii. 172; Dorner, i. 503-4. The mere humanity had been before maintained by the Ebionites (*sup.* p. 47); but Theodotus was the first *Gentile* heresiarch who held this tenet.

^l Gieseler, i. 297.

^m Baron, 196. 8; Tillemont, iii. 78-100; Dorner, i. 508. These grounds were alleged by the writer of the 'Little Labyrinth' (*ap.* Euseb. v. 28), whom

Baron Bunsen and Dr. Wordsworth identify with the author of the 'Philosophumena,' ascribing both works to Hippolytus, Bishop of Portus. Neander (ii. 298) had conjectured that Zephyrinus might have found himself obliged to guard against Artemonism by some new formula; but the *Philosophumena* afford another explanation—that Zephyrinus inclined to the opposite heresy of Noëtus. Thus we may understand why the writer of the *Labyrinth* contented himself with arguments which did not require him to vindicate, or in any way notice, Zephyrinus. (Wordsworth's 'Hippolytus,' 135-7.) Theoderet says that some as-

as students of mathematics and the Aristotelian philosophy rather than of the Scriptures, which they treated in a very arbitrary way, each of their more noted teachers having a copy peculiar to himself.ⁿ

The other tendency which has been mentioned—that which regarded the names of the three Divine Persons as merely designating various aspects or operations of the one Deity—would appear to have existed as early as the days of Justin Martyr;^o but it now for the first time found a distinct utterance in Praxeas. This person was an Asiatic, and, unlike Theodotus, had acquired by his constancy in persecution a degree of credit which was perhaps beyond his deserts, and was dangerous to the balance of his mind. We have already seen that he arrived at Rome when Victor or some other bishop was on the point of recognising the Montanists, and that, by the information which his experience in Asia enabled him to give, backed by his influence as a confessor, he persuaded the bishop to reject them.^p But this good service to the faith was soon followed by the publication of his heresy, which he professed to ground on a few texts—compelling the rest of Holy Scripture to bend to these.^q The sequel of his story is somewhat indistinct; it would seem that, after having been refuted at Rome, he passed over to Carthage, and it is said that he was there drawn into a recantation:^r but perhaps this may have been no more than a disavowal of some tenets or inferences which were wrongly imputed to him.^s He afterwards again maintained his heresy; when Tertullian, who is supposed to have been its chief opponent in the earlier stages, wrote the work against him which is the chief source of information on the subject.^t

cribed the Labyrinth to Origen, but that the style proved it not to be his (Hær. ii. 5); others attribute it to Caius. (Phot. Bibl. 48.) Dr. Routh was the first to conjecture that Hippolytus was the author. Rel. Sac. ii. 143.

ⁿ 'Labyrinth.' ap. Euseb. v. 28. This writer tells a story of one Natalius, who, having acquired high repute as a confessor, was persuaded by the offer of a large stipend to give lustre to the sect of Artemonites, by becoming a bishop among them. He was repeatedly warned against this in dreams, but disregarded them, until at length he had a vision of angels, who inflicted on him a severe beating, of which the marks remained after he awoke. On showing these, and professing deep contrition, he was with

some difficulty readmitted into the Church. See Neander, ii. 298.

^o He indicates its existence in his Dial. c. Tryph. 128. Dörner, i. 518.

^p P. 76; Tert. adv. Prax. 1. From the fact that both Theodotus and Praxeas at first met with a favourable reception at Rome, Neander (ii. 296) shows that the Catholic doctrine as to the *Logos*, from which these heretics varied on different sides, must have been that which previously existed in the Church, instead of being, as Baur supposes, devised by way of a compromise between them.

^q Tert. adv. Prax. 20.

^r Ib. i.

^s Neander. ii. 302.

^t Tertullian is supposed to mean himself in saying that Praxeas was refuted

It now appears that two other teachers of the same kind, who have usually been placed somewhat later, belong to the period embraced in this chapter—Noëtus and Sabellius.^u The common account of Noëtus hardly extends beyond the statements that he was of Ephesus or Smyrna; that, on venting his doctrines, he was questioned and excommunicated by the clergy of some Asiatic city; and that he died shortly after.^x Of Sabellius, personally, nothing was known except that he was a presbyter of the Libyan Pentapolis.^y But the book which has been published as ‘Origen’s Philosophumena,’ and which appears to be really the work of St. Hippolytus, bishop of Portus, at the mouth of the Tiber,^z makes important additions to our information. It is there stated that Epigonus, a disciple of Noëtus, repaired to Rome, and made a proselyte of one Cleomenes, who opened a school of Noëtianism;^a that Cleomenes won over Callistus, who had great influence with the bishop, Zephyrinus (A.D. 202-218); that the bishop, “an illiterate and covetous man,” was bribed into licensing Cleomenes as a teacher, and at length himself became his convert; that Callistus endeavoured, by a crafty policy, to hold the balance between the heretics and the orthodox; that, after succeeding Zephyrinus in the see^b (A.D. 218), he cast off and excommunicated Sabellius, whom he had before misled; and that he founded a new party of *Callistians*—combining laxity of discipline and morals with here-

at Rome, “*per quem Deus voluit.*” (Adv. Prax. i.) He is equally displeased with Praxeas for his good and for his evil:—“*Duo negotia diaboli Praxeas Romæ procuravit; prophetiam expulit et hæresin intulit; Paracletum fugavit et Patrem crucifixit.*” (ib.)

^u Noëtus is usually placed about 235, and Sabellius about 257 (256-270, according to Mr. Clinton, ii. 422). As to Sabellius there had before been a suspicion of error. See below, p. 116. Tillemont would have placed Noëtus about A.D. 200, but for the vague authority of Epiphanius, which he attempts to meet by proposing 220 as a compromise. (ii. 238.)

^x Epiph. lvii. 1.

^y Theod. Hær. ii. 9.

^z Oxford, 1851; edited by M. Emmanuel Miller, of Paris, from a MS. in the Bibliothèque Impériale—one of a number brought from a convent on Mount Athos in 1842. An edition has since been commenced in Germany by Professors Schneidewin and Duncker; and a large literature has already grown

up on the subject. See vol. i. of ‘Christianity and Mankind,’ by C. C. J. Bunsen, D.D., D.C.L., D. Ph., 2nd ed., Lond. 1854; Wordsworth’s ‘St. Hippolytus and his Age,’ Lond. 1853; Döllinger’s ‘Hippolytus and Kallistus,’ Regensb. 1853; Milman’s ‘Latin Christianity,’ i. 42; Churton’s Preface to Pearson’s ‘Vindiciæ Ignatianæ,’ p. xxvii. Professor Döllinger, writing in the papal interest, denies that Hippolytus was bishop of Portus, and regards him as a presbyter, who set up as rival bishop of Rome to Callistus (pp. 73, 101-4, &c.). Against this view (which is maintained with great learning and ability) see a supplemental note in Dean Milman’s 1st volume.

^a It had usually been said, after Theodoret (Hær. iii. 3), that Noëtus was the pupil of Cleomenes, and he of Epigonus; but on comparing the passages (Wordsw. 314) it appears that Theodoret is mistaken. See Bunsen, i. 386.

^b See Wordsworth, 84-91.

tical doctrine.^c According to this account, then, it appears that both Sabellius and some followers of Noëtus were teaching at Rome in the early years of the third century.

The kind of error which was common to Praxeas,^d Noëtus, and Sabellius, was capable of various forms. Thus, it might be held that the one Godhead dwelt in the man Jesus in such a way as to justify the name *Patripassian*, given to Praxeas by his opponents, who argued that, if there were no distinction of persons, the Father must be the same who suffered on the cross;^e or that the names of the Three Persons denote so many energies, emanating from the one Monad, and again to be absorbed into Him after the fulfilment of their work.^f Noëtus was more refined than Praxeas, and Sabellius than Noëtus. Sabellius maintained that God is in Himself the Monad; that when revealed, He is *extended* into the Trinity.^g He acknowledged three *persons*, but used the word in a sense which may be termed merely dramatic—as meaning *characters*, assumed or represented. He illustrated his idea by comparison with the three elements of man—body, soul, and spirit; and with the threefold combination in the sun, of shape or substance, light, and heat.^h

It does not appear that Praxeas was able to found a sect. Theodoret mentions Callistus as the successor of Noëtus;ⁱ and this person, of whose earlier life a very discreditable account is given in the *Philosophumena*, is now, by means of that work, identified with a canonised bishop of Rome.^k But although the heresy, thus supported, flourished for a time, the Noëtians or Callistians soon became extinct. The sect of Sabellians is said to

^c *Philosophumena*, lib. ix.; Wordsw. 226–275. This is supposed to throw light on a passage of Tertullian which has caused much perplexity—“Audio etiam edictum esse propositum, et quidem peremptorium. Pontifex scilicet maximus, quod est episcopus episcoporum, edicit, ‘Ego et mœchiæ et fornicationis delicta pœnitentia functis dimitto.’ O edictum, cui adscribi non poterit Bonum factum!” &c. *De Pudicitia*, 1.

^d It is very remarkable that St. Hippolytus, in his view of all the heresies, makes no mention of Praxeas.

^e Tillem. iii. 75.

^f See Mosh. 688–699; Newman on Arianism, 128, seqq.; Gieseler, I. i. 299–300; Dorner, i. 696, seqq.

^g Theod. Hær. ii. 9, 10. A passage in which St. Athanasius (*Orat.* iv. c.

Arianos, 25) has been generally supposed to ascribe this opinion to Sabellius (as by Neander, ii. 319, and Döllinger, *Hipp. u. Kall.* 204), is referred by Dr. Newman to Marcellus of Ancyra. (Note in *Athan. Discourses*, 543.)

^h Epiph. lxii. 1; Neander, ii. 318–320; Dorner, i. 703. Dorner says (i. 807) that Sabellianism was “Docetism raised to a higher power” (*i.e.* it transferred to the Divinity that notion of unreal appearance which Docetism connected with the Saviour’s human body).

ⁱ Hær. iii. 3. Comp. Wordsworth, 133.

^k In the pseudo-Isidorian decretals (as to which see vol. ii. b. iv. c. 1), Sylvester I. is represented as condemning Callistus for Sabellianism, but without any suspicion that he was one of his own predecessors. *Hard.* i. 289, c. 2.

have lasted into the fifth century.¹ It was, however, never numerous; and the significance of Sabellius' name is not as the founder of a separate body, but as indicating one of the tendencies into which speculation has run when exercised on the mystery of the Godhead.

In this period we find that Christianity and heathen philosophy, in preparing for a continuation of their struggle, adopt something of each other's armour; and Alexandria—a city of which the intellectual character has been already sketched in connexion with the origin of Gnosticism—becomes the chief seat, both of philosophical Christianity and of the reformed paganism. If the Gospel were to make its way on such ground, it was necessary that it should be presented in a shape attractive to men of learning and cultivation.^m The Catechetical School of Alexandria is said by some writers to have existed even from the time of St. Mark;ⁿ if so, it was probably at first nothing more than an institution for the teaching of catechumens, or proselytes who were preparing for baptism. But about the middle of the second century it assumed a different character, and became a seminary for the training of clergy, and for completing the instruction of the most highly educated converts.^o The mastership was held by a succession of eminent men, of whom the first that can be named with certainty was Pantænus, a convert from the Stoic philosophy.^p Pantænus is described by his pupil Clement^q as superior to all his contemporaries; St. Jerome^r tells us that he composed many commentaries on Scripture, but did still greater service to the Church by his oral teaching. He is also celebrated as having undertaken a missionary journey into India^s—a name which has in this case been variously interpreted as meaning Hindostan, Arabia, and Ethiopia or Abyssinia.^t Although the order of the events in his life is uncertain, it has been generally supposed that Pantænus

¹ Schröckh, iv. 168. They are mentioned, and their baptism is rejected, in the viith canon attributed to the Second General Council (A.D. 381). But that canon is spurious.

^m Gieseler, I. i. 312.

ⁿ Hieron. de VV. Illustr. 36.

^o Bingham, III. x. 5; Mosh. 273; Schröckh, iii. 187; Matter, 'Ecole d'Alexandrie,' i. 287, seqq.; Neand. ii. 227.

^p Euseb. v. 10. 'As to Athenagoras, see above, p. 34.

^q See below, p. 88, n. ^r.

^r De VV. Illustr. 36.

^s Euseb. v. 10; Tillem. (iii. 173) dates it about 189; Gieseler (I. i. 161), about 180. Mr. Clinton says that it was "not before" A.D. 190.

^t See Mosh. 206-7, who, with Neander (i. 111-2) and Gieseler, understands Arabia to be meant; and, since it is stated by Eusebius that Pantænus found a Gospel of St. Matthew in Hebrew letters, which had been left by the Apostle St. Bartholomew, Mosheim supposes that those who invited him must have been Jewish Christians.

presided over the Catechetical School before this expedition, and that he resumed the mastership on his return.^u

His successor was Clement—usually styled after the place of his residence, although he was probably a native of Athens.^x Clement had been converted to the faith after reaching manhood, and had then travelled through various countries in search of wisdom, until at length he found satisfaction in the teaching of Pantænus.^y After having presided over the school for some years, he was driven from his post by the persecution of Severus. Of his after life it is only known that he sojourned in Cappadocia and at Jerusalem; but he is supposed to have returned to Alexandria, and to have died there about the year 220.^z

By these men a new system of thought was introduced into the Church. The earlier Christians, for the most part, had viewed all heathen philosophy through the medium of the dislike occasioned by its opposition to the Gospel; a large party of them had referred its origin to the devil,^a or to the angels who had fallen through their love for the “daughters of men.”^b Clement, however, claims for philosophy a far different source. It is, he says, “the gift of God,” “a work of Divine Providence;”^c it had been given to the Greeks, even as the Law was to the Jews, and for like purposes; it had been necessary for their justification before Christ came, and was still to be regarded as a preparative for the Gospel; and, if rightly understood, was compatible with it.^d And by *philosophy*, he declares, was not here meant the system of any sect in particular, but the *eclectic*, which embodies whatsoever is well said by each of the sects in teaching righteousness and religious knowledge, while he would distinguish the truth thus conveyed from the human reasonings with which it is adulterated.^e He maintains that all learning may be sanctified and turned to good; that the cultivation of it is necessary in order to confute the sophistries of false philosophy.^f He labours to vindicate the claim of the “barbarians” to philosophical knowledge,^g to identify the doctrines of

^u See note on St. Jerome, De VV. Illustr. c. 38 (t. i. p. 653); Cave, Hist. Lit. i. 51. Archdeacon Evans thinks that he did not become master of the school until after his mission, i. 293.

^x Tillem. iii. 181.

^y Clem. Strom. i. 1, p. 322, and notes; Euseb. v. 11; Kaye, on Clement, 113.

^z Tillem. iii. 183; Gieseler, i. 314.

^a Clem. Strom. vi. 8, p. 773.

^b Mosh. 278-9; Kaye, 119. Tertullian (De Præscr. 7) expresses himself very strongly as to the incompatibility

of philosophy with Christian faith. See Gieseler, I. i. 345; vi. 57. Clement himself thinks that secrets were communicated by the angels who loved the daughters of men, Strom. v. 1, p. 670.

^c Strom. i. 1, p. 327; i. 2.

^d Strom. i. 5, p. 331; vii. 3, p. 839; Mosh. 275; Kaye, 116, 237-8, 428.

^e Strom. i. 7, p. 338. Comp. vi. 7, p. 768, and Newman on Arianism, 91-92, 98.

^f Strom. i. 9; i. 27, p. 377; vi. 10.

^g Ib. i. 14-16; vi. 8, p. 774.

philosophy with those of Scripture, and to derive the wisdom of the Greeks from the sacred oracles of the Hebrews.^h

In these opinions there was much that savoured of Gnosticism; but the more orthodox Alexandrian school differed from the Gnostics by denying the alleged opposition between faith and knowledge, and maintaining that faith must lie under all Christian knowledge, in every stage of the spiritual and intellectual progress.ⁱ The work of Christian philosophy was to unfold to knowledge the meaning of the truths which had been embraced by faith; faith receives its doctrines from tradition, and knowledge must be able to prove them from Scripture.^k The term *Gnostic* was adopted by the Alexandrians to denote the highest Christian character.^l Of Clement's three chief extant works, which form a series rising one above another, while the first (the "Exhortation to the Gentiles") is addressed to persons without the Church, and the second (the "Pedagogue") contains moral instruction for converts, the third, which, from its miscellaneous character, has the title of "Stromata" (Tapestry-work),^m is intended to portray the character of the perfect Gnostic, and, by supplying instruction which might satisfy the highest desires of the intellect, to preserve from the "knowledge falsely so called" of such teachers as Basilides and Valentinus.

The combination of philosophy with the Gospel led, however, to some very questionable results. In Clement's own hands—especially if we may trust the accounts which are given of a lost work entitled "Hypotyposes"ⁿ—it appears to have sometimes gone beyond the bounds of orthodoxy; and, when taken up by Origen and others, it became yet more decidedly dangerous.^o

The most lasting of the evils which this school introduced into the Church was its license of figurative interpretation in explaining Holy Scripture. For this Alexandria was a congenial soil; there it had been employed on the Old Testament to an immoderate extent by Philo;^p and the epistle which is ascribed to St. Barna-

^h Cohort. ad Gentes, 6, p. 60; Strom. i. 25; ii. 18; vi. 2, seqq. He says that Scripture charges the Greeks with being "thieves" of the barbaric philosophy—which is supposed to be an allusion to St. John x. 8. Strom. ii. 1, init., and note.

ⁱ Clem. Pædag. i. 6, pp. 117, seqq.; Strom. ii. 6, p. 445.

^k Strom. vii. 10, p. 866; Neander, ii. 228-231.

^l Strom. i. 13.

^m The title is explained, l. iv. c. 2.

ⁿ Photius, Biblioth. 109. Baron Bunsen supposes the so-called viiith book of the Stromata, and the 'Excerpta ex Theodoto,' to be parts of the Hypotyposes. See Analecta, t. 1.

^o Mosh. 274; Neander, ii. 245; Gieseler, I. i. 322. On Clement's almost *doctetic* language (e.g. Strom. vi. 9, p. 775) see Neander, ii. 370; Hagenbach, i. 169; Redepenning's Origenes, i. 442; Gieseler, vi. 442.

^p See Gfrörer, i. 59-61. Origen highly praises Philo. C. Celsum, iv. 51.

bas, and in which this method is perhaps carried as far as in any Christian writing, was probably the work of an Alexandrian convert from Judaism. But whereas the figurative interpretation had hitherto been an unregulated practice, it was now reduced to method. Scripture, it was said, has three senses—the historical, the moral, and the mystical; and the first of these was treated as if it were merely subservient to the others.^a There was something in the system attractive at once to ingenuity of speculation and to a pious feeling of the depth of God's Word; but the effect too commonly was, that, instead of seeking for the real meaning of each passage, men set themselves to discover some fanciful analogy to ideas which they had derived from other parts of Scripture, or from altogether different sources. The historical sense was lost sight of, or even denied; the moral sense was often perverted;^r nor can an unprejudiced reader open any work in which this kind of interpretation is followed without feeling how utterly unlike it is, in its general character, to those Scriptural instances of figurative interpretation which its advocates allege as precedents for it. The facilities which it afforded for pretending to prove anything whatever from Scripture must no doubt have contributed to render it popular, both in the Church and among sectaries.^s In our own time, while an unhappy attempt has been made to revive it in the English Church, it has been turned to a very different account by the German school which would resolve the Scripture narrative into a series of fables. These writers claim Origen and his brother allegorists as their own forerunners; for why (they ask) should such violence have been done to Scripture in the way of

^a Origen in Levit. v. 5; Mosh. 629, seqq.

^r The following comment on St. Matth. i. 6, which has the authority of St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, and many others, may be cited as an instance:—"Mystically, David is Christ. Urias, i.e. *God is my light*, is the devil, who says, *I will be like the Highest* (Is. xiv. 14). To him the Church was married, when Christ on the throne of the Majesty of His Father loved her, and, having made her beautiful, united her to Himself in wedlock. Or Urias is the Jewish nation, who through the law boasted of their light. From them Christ took away the Law, having taught it to speak of Himself. Bersabee is the '*well of satiety*,' that is, the abundance of spiritual grace." (Gloss. quoted in the '*Catena Aurea*,' i. 28, Oxf.

1841; Ambros. Apol. pro Dav. 3; Aug. c. Faust. xxii. 87; Raban. Maur. in loc. Patrol. cvii. 734.) Augustine, indeed, says, "*Iste quidem David graviter scelestaque peccavit*;" but it would not be easy to bring the interpretation under the principle which he lays down (ibid. 83), "*Quæ ad significandum scribuntur, nihil refert in moribus facientium, quam laudem reprehensionemve mereantur, si modo habeant aliquam rei, de qua agitur, necessarium præfigurandi congruentiam.*" In the hands of Latin writers the mystical system was liable to additional abuse, inasmuch as their interpretations were often founded on a misconstruction of Greek as well as of Hebrew words.

^s It had been much used by the Valentians. Iren. i. 3; i. 8; ii. 24.

allegorical interpretation, but that the fathers felt its literal sense to be absurd, revolting, and incredible?[†]

In common with some heathen sects, with the school of Philo, and with the Gnostics, the Alexandrians professed to possess a higher and more mysterious knowledge of religious things, derived from tradition, and hidden from those who were not worthy to receive it.^u By the system which is styled the "Discipline of the Secret"^x was not meant that concealment of the higher doctrines and rites which was practised towards the heathen, and was in part continued towards the converts who were in training for baptism; but, as appears from the hints given by Clement, the matters which it held in reserve were philosophical explanations of Christian doctrine, and precepts for the formation of the perfect Gnostic.^y He compares the discipline to withholding a knife from children out of fear lest they should cut themselves.^z This method is supposed to have originated not long before the time of Clement, and it was impossible that it should last. While we admit a legitimate use of discretion in communicating religious knowledge, we cannot but see that in this kind of reserve there were great dangers; and in the hands of the Alexandrians it undoubtedly led to a system of equivocation towards the uninitiated which was injurious to truth and morality.^a

The opposition on the side of heathen philosophy which has been mentioned was through the Neoplatonic school—founded at Alexandria in the reign of Severus, by Ammonius, who, from having been a porter in early life, was styled *Saccas*, or the Sack-carrier.^b Although his doctrine professed to be a continuation of Platonism, it was mixed with tenets from other Grecian systems, and also contained a strong Egyptian element.^c It is especially remarkable for the new views which it opened on the subject of heathen religion. Hitherto Platonists had been content to main-

[†] See the Introduction to Strauss' 'Leben Jesu,' and comp. Evans, i. 304-9.

^u Clem. Strom. i. 12; vii. 10, p. 865. Tertullian (De Præscr. 22) strongly denies the existence of such secret tradition. See Kaye on Clement, 362; on Tertullian, 31-3, 234-5.

^x Gieseler (I. i. 354), states that this term appears to have been first used by G. T. Meier, in a book published A.D. 1679.

^y Mosh. 303, seqq.; Kaye on Clem. 362. The idea of some Romish controversialists, that the later peculiarities of their system had been preserved in the

early church by the *Disciplina Arcani*, appears to be now abandoned in favour of the "Development" theory. See Bingham, X. x. 1; Schröckh, iv. 373; Philaethes Cantabrigiensis (Bp. Kaye), in British Magazine, iv. 402-3; Archer Butler on Development, 12. On the difference between Clement's system of reserve and that of the fourth century, see Gieseler, I. i. 355.

^z Strom. i. 1, p. 324. See Blunt on the Fathers, 171.

^a Gieseler, i. 319-20.

^b Tillem. iii. 279.

^c Mosh. 293.

tain the popular system outwardly, while they taught a more refined doctrine to their disciples; but now paganism was to be itself reformed; it was to be explained as a scheme of purer and deeper character, so that either the way might be paved for a combination with the Gospel, or a position might be gained for effectively resisting its advances.^d The Neoplatonists admitted that Christianity contained great truths, but asserted that in it these were obscured by barbarism, and that the old traditional religion, if freed from popular corruptions and rightly understood, would be found to exhibit them in a purer form.^e Christ Himself was classed with sages of the first rank; it was said that his object had been to reform religion; that his own views had agreed with those of the Neoplatonists, but that his followers had corrupted his system by spurious additions—among which were the doctrines of his Godhead and mediation, and the prohibition of worshipping the gods.^f Neoplatonism had much in common with some forms of Gnosticism; it aimed at uniting the wisdom of all ages and of all nations in one comprehensive scheme; and in order to effect the union it had recourse to many strange evasions and forced constructions.^g It laid down the doctrine of one Supreme God, and recognised the Platonic Trinity, consisting of the Supreme, his Intelligence (νοῦς), and his Soul (Ψυχὴ).^h In subordination to these, it held the existence of many inferior gods and demons, the ministers of the Supreme; and it represented the vulgar polytheism as a corruption of this truth.ⁱ With the loftier doctrines of the sect were combined much fanciful superstition and a devotion to theurgical practices. Its practical precepts were severe; an ascetic life was required in order to emancipation from the bonds of sense, to the acquisition of power over spirits, and to union with the Deity.^k

^d Gieseler, I. i. 250–4. Neander (i. 46–7) well shows how Platonism prepared for the Gospel, and yet became its bitter enemy. See too Schaff, i. 155–160.

^e Gieseler, I. i. 254; Ozanam, *Civil. Chrét. au 5me Siècle*, i. 127, seqq. “Clemens affirmed that truth was dispersed in different portions through most of the stories of the pagan mythology and the several sects of philosophy, and that the great error of the heathens consisted principally in this, that each nation, party, and sect, having but a portion of truth, and some of them a very small portion of it, persuaded themselves that they possessed the whole; whereas Ammonius is said to have

affirmed that each sect and party would be found to be possessed of all the most important doctrines of true religion, if their principles, tenets, and mythologies were properly interpreted.” Morgan on the Trinity of Plato, p. 121, ed. Holden, Cambr. 1853.

^f Augustin. *de Civ. Dei*, XIX. xxiii. 2, 4 (quoting a lost work of Porphyry); *De Consensu Evang.* i. 7, 9, 34.

^g Mosh. 283; Tzschirner, 424; W. A. Butler's *Lectures on Ancient Philosophy*, ii. 359.

^h Butler, ii. 354–6; Ozanam, i. 129.

ⁱ Mosh. 284, 292; Gieseler, I. i. 251–2.

^k Mosh. 289; Tzschirner, 436; Gieseler, I. i. 252.

Ammonius was originally a Christian; and it has been maintained by some that, notwithstanding the character of his oral and secret teaching, he remained to the end in outward communion with the Church.¹ It is, however, more commonly believed that he openly lapsed into heathenism. Among his pupils were both Christians and pagans; of the former, Origen was the most eminent; of the latter he may be said to have founded a dynasty, which included Plotinus, Porphyry, and Iamblichus.^m It may be easily understood that a system so comprehensive as Neoplatonism had strong attractions for persons perplexed by the controversies of Christians with pagans, of orthodox with heterodox, and of philosophical sects with each other. It soon almost superseded every other form of heathen philosophy; it lasted until the sixth century; and in it the Gospel found the most subtle and the most formidable of its adversaries.ⁿ But the very refinement of the system unfitted it for obtaining a hold on the mass of mankind; and the living conviction of the truth of the old religions was gone for ever.^o

¹ Porphyry is contradicted by Eusebius (vi. 19), for stating that Ammonius, after becoming a philosopher, forsook Christianity. But, although Baronius (234. 5), Tillemont (iii. 279), and Cave (i. 72), adhere to Eusebius, while Bayle appears unexpectedly on their side (*Art. Ammonius*), and Dr. Newman is inclined to agree with them (*Arians*, 113),—and although Mosheim, after having maintained the contrary, came over to the same opinion (281-2),—it is generally supposed that Eusebius was mistaken,

and confounded Saccas with another Ammonius. Brucker, ii. 207-9; Schröckh, iii. 290; Heinichen, not. in Euseb. t. ii. 202; Burton, ii. 293; Neander, ii. 464; Gieseler, I. i. 251.

^m Tillem. iii. 283-4; Mosh. 281; Gieseler, I. i. 251. Plotinus, however, settled at Rome; and there was no eminent teacher of the sect at Alexandria after the founder's death. Newman on Arianism, 119; Gfrörer, i. 453, seqq.

ⁿ Mosh. 281; Schröckh, iii. 297.

^o Tzschirner, 473-4; Milman, ii. 239.

CHAPTER VI.

FROM ALEXANDER SEVERUS TO VALERIAN.

A.D. 222-260.

ELAGABALUS was succeeded in 222 by his cousin Alexander Severus, a boy of sixteen. The young emperor was inclined to favour the Christians, partly through the influence of his mother, Mammæa, who, notwithstanding her acknowledged vices of avarice and ambition, is described both by heathen writers and by Eusebius as a "very devout woman."^a Alexander had many Christians in his household.^b In appointing to civil offices he adopted a rule observed by the Church in ordinations—that the names of candidates should be publicly exhibited, and that an opportunity of objecting to them should be allowed.^c He frequently used the evangelical maxim of "doing to others as we would that they should do to us," and caused it to be inscribed on the walls of his palace, and of other public buildings.^d When a piece of land, which had been regarded as common, was taken by a Christian congregation as a site for a church, and the company of vicuallers at Rome set up a rival claim, he adjudged it to the Christians, on the ground that any kind of religious use would be better than the conversion of it into a tavern.^e Nay, it is said that he thought of enrolling Christ among the gods, and erecting a temple to Him.^f

It is, however, a mistake to consider either the emperor or his mother a Christian.^g Mammæa's interest in the Gospel appears to

^a Θεοσεβιστάτη καὶ εὐλαβὴς (Euseb. vi. 21). "Mulier sancta, sed avara, et auri atque argenti cupida." Lamprid. Vit. Alex. 15.

^b Euseb. vi. 28.

^c Lampr. 45.

^d "Quod a quibusdam sive Judæis sive Christianis audierat. . . . Quod tibi fieri non vis, alteri ne feceris." (Lampr. 51.) In this negative form the maxim is found not only in the Talmud, but (as Gibbon, v. 287, observes) in Isocrates. The Christian maxim, however, is *positive*—a very important difference. See

Guizot, note on Gibbon, in loc., and Tholuck, Ausleg. der Bergpredigt, ed. 3, p. 436. We may ask, then,—(1) Is Lampridius right in saying that Alexander used the negative form? (2) If so, did he derive it from a Christian source?

^e Lampr. 49. This was the origin of the Church of S. Maria in Trastevere.

^f Ibid. 43.

^g Tillemont vainly tries to believe this as to Mammæa. Hist. des Emp. iii. 279.

have really not extended beyond a slight inquiry into its doctrines and a favourable opinion of its professors. Alexander's religion was eclectic: he had in his oratory images, not only of Roman gods, including such of his predecessors as had been deified, but of Isis and Serapis, of Orpheus, Abraham, and Apollonius of Tyana; and with these was joined the image of the Saviour.^h It is evident, therefore, that the emperor did not regard Christianity as the one true religion, but as one of many forms, all acceptable to the Deity, all containing somewhat of truth, and differing only in outward circumstances; that he revered its Founder, not as Divine, but as one worthy to be ranked among the chief sages who had enlightened and benefited mankind.ⁱ Nor, although the Christians were, on the whole, practically tolerated in this reign, was anything done towards the establishment of a formal and legal toleration; indeed there were some instances of persecution and martyrdom, and it was probably under Alexander that the celebrated lawyer Ulpian, in his book 'On the duties of a Pro-consul,' made an elaborate digest of the laws against the profession of the Gospel.^k

The estimable but somewhat weak Alexander was murdered in 235; and the Christians suffered from his successor, Maximin the Thracian, for the favour which they had lately enjoyed. The barbarian emperor's motives for persecution were wholly independent of religion; for of that, in any form, he was utterly regardless—melting down for his own uses the plate, and even the images, of temples. His rage was directed against such Christians only as had been connected with the court—among whom Origen was especially noted. But about the same time earthquakes in several provinces afforded a pretext for popular risings; and in this tumultuary way churches were burnt and many Christians were put to death.^l

The reign of Gordian (A.D. 238-244) and that of Philip (A.D. 244-249) were friendly to the Church. Origen, writing under the latter, says that God had given the Christians the free exercise of their religion,^m and anticipates the conversion of the empire;ⁿ—a new idea, remarkably opposed to the tone of the earlier Christian writers, who had always regarded the Roman

^h Lampr. 29.

ⁱ Mosh. 465; Milman, ii. 230-1.

^k Lactant. Div. Instit. v. 11. Gieseler places Ulpian's digest under Caracalla. (I. i. 258.)

^l Euseb. vi. 28; Baron. 237. 4-7; Tillem. Emp. iii. 271, 281; Gibbon, i. 182-3, 571.

^m Adv. Cels. vii. 26.

ⁿ Ibid. viii. 68.

power as incurably hostile and persecuting,—as an oppression from which there could be no hope of deliverance except through the coming of the end.^o Under Philip Rome completed the thousandth year from its foundation, and it has been dwelt on as a

remarkable circumstance that the event took place under
A.D. 248.

a Christian emperor. The great games with which it was celebrated, however, were purely heathen in character; and, although it seems to be true that both Philip and his wife received letters from Origen,^p there is little reason for supposing that the emperor's guilty life was combined with a belief of the Gospel.^q Towards the end of the reign there was a persecution at Alexandria.^r

Decius is memorable as the first emperor who attempted to
A.D. 249– extirpate the Christian religion by a general persecution
251. of its professors.^s His edicts are lost; but the records of the time exhibit a departure from the system which had been usually observed by enemies of the Church since the days of Trajan. The authorities sought out Christians; the legal order as to accusations was neglected; accusers ran no risk; and popular clamour was admitted instead of formal information.^t

The long enjoyment of peace had told unfavourably on the Church. Cyprian in the West and Origen in the East speak of the secular spirit which had crept in among its members—of the pride, the luxury, the covetousness of the higher clergy; of the careless and irreligious lives of the people.^u And when, as Origen had foretold, a new season of trial came, the effects of the general relaxation were sadly displayed. On being summoned, in obe-

^o Neander, i. 179.

^p Euseb. vi. 36.

^q See Huet, *Origeniana*, I. iii. 12. The story of Philip's having been excluded from the Paschal solemnities by Babylas, bishop of Antioch, until he had submitted to penance for his sins (Chron. Paschal., A.D. 253), is for the most part rejected by recent writers. Eusebius mentions it only as a current tradition, and does not name the bishop (vi. 34); while St. Chrysostom names the bishop, but not the emperor. (Hom. ii. de S. Bab. t. ii. p. 545.) See Pagi, iii. 588–9; Bayle, art. *Babylas*, note C.; Muratori, *Annali*, A.D. 245; Schröckh, iv. 13; Burton, ii. 215; Neand. i. 176; Clinton, ii. 51–3. But Tillemont (Emp. iii. 300–3, 401–2) is doubtful, and Mosheim (476) takes the opposite side; while Niebuhr (*Lectures*, ed. Schmitz,

iii. 320–1) does not altogether reject the idea of Philip's having been a Christian, or even the account of his penance, but suggests that he may have been a catechumen until just before his death, and may then have been baptized.

^r From a misunderstanding of Dionysius (ap. Euseb. vi. 41), it has been said that this persecution was instigated by a “poet and soothsayer.” But Bishop Pearson points out that the words *μάντις καὶ ποιητής* are to be connected with *κακῶν*, and mean “malorum vates et auctor.” *Annales Cyprianici*, p. 11, in Fell's *Cyprian*, Oxf. 1683.

^s Mosh. 478; Rettberg's *Cyprianus* Götting. 1831, p. 7.

^t Mosh. 481.

^u Cyp. de *Lapsis*, 5–6; Orig. in *Josu.* Hom. vii. 6; in *Matth.*; Hom. x. 2; c. Cels. viii. 44.

dience to the emperor's edict, to appear and offer sacrifice, multitudes of Christians rushed to the forum in every city—some induced by fear of confiscation, some by a wish to retain offices in the public service, some by dread of tortures, some by the entreaties of friends and kindred; it seemed, says St. Cyprian, as if they had long been eager to find an opportunity of disowning their faith.^y The persecution was especially directed against the bishops and clergy. Among its victims were Fabian of Rome, Babylas of Antioch, and Alexander of Jerusalem; while in the lives of other eminent men (as Cyprian, Origen, Gregory Thaumaturgus, and Dionysius of Alexandria) the period is marked by exile or other sufferings.^z The chief object, however, was not to inflict death on the Christians, but to force them to a recantation: with this view they were subjected to tortures, imprisonment, and want of food; and under such trials the constancy of many gave way.^a Many withdrew into voluntary banishment; among these was Paul, a young man of Alexandria, who took up his abode in the desert of the Thebaid, and is celebrated as the first Christian hermit.^b The violence of the persecution did not last above a year; in the end of 251 Decius was killed in battle with the Goths;^c and the short reign of Gallus passed away without injury to the Christians, except that in some provinces they suffered from the outrages of the populace, who charged them with having caused a plague which for fifteen years afflicted the empire.^d

A.D. 251-3.

Valerian, the successor of Gallus, is described by Dionysius of Alexandria as having for a time been more favourable to the Church than even those among his predecessors who had been reputed Christians—words which are supposed to designate Alexander, and either Philip or Mammæa.^e But in his fifth year the emperor changed his policy, at the instigation of Macrianus, his chief adviser, who is said to have been connected with Egyptian magicians.^f At first it was thought that the Gospel might be suppressed by removing the teachers of the Church and forbidding its members to hold assemblies for worship, or to

A.D. 253-260.

^y Euseb. vi. 41; Cyp. de Lapsis, 8; Tillem. iii. 314-8; religions. Mosh. 669. See below, c. viii. sect. 4.

^z Euseb. vi. 39; Baron. 253.

^a Tillem. iii. 312; Mosh. 481.

^b Hieron. Vita Pauli, 1, 4. It is, however, questioned whether Paul was the first to introduce among Christians that idea of a solitary and contemplative life which had been common in other

^c Gibbon, i. 264.

^d Tillem. Emp. iii. 385; Pagi, iii. 23.

^e Dion. ap. Euseb. vii. 10. See Clinton, ii. 51.

^f Dion. l. c.; Mosh. 552; Gibbon, i. 572.

resort to the cemeteries.^g Finding, however, that these measures had no decided effect, Valerian issued a second edict, by which it was ordered that the clergy should be put to death;

A.D. 258. that senators and knights should be deprived of their dignities and property, and, if they persisted in the faith, should be capitally punished; and that women of rank should suffer confiscation of property and should be banished:^h but even this edict did not enact any penalty against persons of inferior station, so that the great mass of Christians would seem to have been unmolested. The attempt to check the progress of the Gospel was utterly ineffectual. The Church had been purified and strengthened by her late calamities; there were now few instances of apostacy such as those which had been so common under Decius. The faith and patience of the martyrs animated their surviving brethren, and impressed many of the heathen; bishops, when driven from their flocks, were followed by multitudes of believers; and in the places of their exile they found opportunities for spreading the doctrine of Christ among people to whom it was before unknown.ⁱ

Dionysius applies to Valerian the Apocalyptic description of the beast to whom was given "a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies," with "power to continue forty and two months."^k After having lasted three years and a half, the persecution was ended by the capture and death of the emperor in

A.D. 260. Persia—a calamity and disgrace without example in the Roman annals. Among the martyrs under Valerian were Xystus, bishop of Rome, with his deacon, Laurence; and Cyprian, bishop of Carthage.

Of the eminent men of this period, those who most especially claim our notice are Origen, Dionysius of Alexandria, and Cyprian.

I. Origen was born at Alexandria about the year 185, and from his childhood was carefully trained, both in literature and in religion, by his father, Leonides, who was a Christian, and by profession a teacher of rhetoric.^l He daily learnt by heart a portion of the Scriptures, and thus laid the foundation of his extraor-

^g Acta. Proconsul. S. Cypriani, c. 1 (Patrol. iii. 1500); Mosh. 551-3.

^h Cypr. Ep. 80.

ⁱ Mosh. 556; Schröckh, iv. 233.

^k Rev. xiii. 5; Dion. ap. Euseb. vii. 10.

^l Euseb. vi. 2; Clinton, A.D. 185;

Redepenning's 'Origenes,' Bonn, 1846.

i. 44. From the name *Origen*—Son of

Or, or *Horus*—it has been inferred that Leonides was not converted until after the birth of his son. But innumerable instances prove that the early Christians did not proscribe names derived from heathen deities. Huet, *Origeniana*, I. i. 2 (in vol. iv. of Origen's works); Redep. i. 45.

dinary biblical knowledge, and also of that reverence for the sacred writings which controlled him in all the wanderings of his speculations. The tendency of his mind was early shown by the questions which he put to his father as to the meaning of Scripture—endeavouring to discover a sense beyond that which lay on the surface. Leonides, although himself no enemy to the deeper system of interpretation, discouraged such inquiries as unsuitable to his son's years; but his heart was filled with joy and thankfulness on account of the rare gifts which appeared in the boy.^m Origen studied at the catechetical school, under the mastership of Clement, and there formed a friendship with Alexander, afterwards bishop of Jerusalem, which had an important influence on his life.ⁿ

The persecution of Severus was particularly violent at Alexandria, and Leonides was one of the victims. Origen was eager for martyrdom, and was saved only through the precaution of his mother, who, by hiding his clothes, prevented him from going forth to expose himself to danger. He wrote to his father while in prison, exhorting him not to be shaken in his constancy by a regard for those whom he was to leave behind him.^o As the death of Leonides was accompanied by the seizure of his property, the widow with her seven children fell into deep distress. Origen, who was the eldest of the seven, was compassionately received into the house of a wealthy Christian lady; but in this asylum he was annoyed by the presence of a Gnostic teacher, Paul of Antioch, whom his benefactress had adopted and intended to make her heir. The eloquence of Paul was such as even to attract many of the orthodox; but Origen, although he could not avoid some intercourse with him, steadily refused to attend any of his lectures.^p

The catechetical school had been broken up by the persecution. Clement, as we have seen,^q had left Alexandria—not out of any unworthy regard for his personal safety, but in compliance with his view of Christian duty.^r In these circumstances, Origen, whose extraordinary abilities and precocious learning were already noted, received applications from some educated heathens who wished to be instructed in Christian doctrine; and having thus, at the age of eighteen, found himself drawn into assuming the office of a public teacher, he was soon after formally appointed by the bishop, Demetrius, to the mastership of the catechetical school. Among

^m Euseb. vi. 2.

ⁿ Ibid. 6, 14; Redep. i. 55-6, 434-6.

^o Euseb. vi. 2. In maturer years Origen saw the error of the zeal which

would court danger. In Matth. xvi. 1.

^p Euseb. vi. 2.

^q P. 88.

^r See Clem. Strom. vii. 11, p. 871.

his earliest pupils were two brothers, Heraclas, eventually bishop of Alexandria, and Plutarch.^s

The persecution was renewed with increased violence on the arrival of a new governor. Plutarch and others of Origen's scholars were martyred. Their master stood by them to encourage them in their sufferings; nor did he himself escape without having been severely treated by the populace.^t

Wishing to be exempt from the necessity of taking any payment for his lessons, in obedience (as he supposed) to the text, "Freely ye have received, freely give," he sold a valuable collection of his own manuscripts for an allowance of four oboli a-day, and on this scanty income he contrived to live. He endeavoured to realise to the letter the Gospel precepts of poverty. He had but one coat, which was too thin to protect him against the cold of winter; he walked barefoot; he contented himself with such food as was absolutely necessary, abstaining from flesh and wine; he spent the greater part of the night in study; and when he slept, it was on the bare floor. By these austerities were sown the seeds of ailments which afflicted him throughout his life.^u

Among those who resorted to his lectures were many young women. The intercourse with such pupils exposed him both to temptations and to the risk of slander; and from a wish to avoid these evils he acted literally on our Lord's words, that some "have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake." Although he endeavoured to conceal the act, it came to the knowledge of Demetrius; and the bishop, at the time, commended his zeal, and encouraged him to continue his labours in the catechetical school.^x

His fame as a teacher increased. In addition to his theological instructions, he lectured in *grammar*—a term which then included most of the branches of general literature; his school was frequented by Jews, heathens, and Gnostics, of whom many were led through the pursuit of secular learning to embrace the faith of the Gospel.^y The requirements of his position induced him to seek after a fuller acquaintance with heathen philosophy than that which he had gained from Clement; and for this purpose he became a hearer of Ammonius Saccas.^z It has been inferred, from the circumstances which have been mentioned as to Origen's conduct in early life, that he was then addicted to an extremely

^s Euseb. vi. 3.

^t Ibid. vi. 3-4.

^u Ibid. vi. 3; Redep. i. 196-202.

^x Euseb. vi. 8; Huet, I. i. 13.

^y Euseb. vi. 8.

^z Ibid. 19. Tillemont (iii. 517) places this after Origen's visit to Rome; Clinton, in 206.

literal interpretation of the Scriptures—a system very opposite to that which he pursued in maturer years; and the supposed change has been ascribed to the influence of Ammonius. But the truth would rather appear to be, that both in his earlier and in his later phases he was animated by the same spirit. The actions which his judgment afterwards condemned as carnal were prompted by a desire to emancipate himself from the flesh; and that which he really derived from Ammonius was not a contradiction of his former principles, but a development and enlargement of his views.^a

The peace which the Christians enjoyed during the reign of Caracalla induced Origen to visit Rome, where the Church was then under the government of Zephyrinus.^b After ^{A.D. 211.} a short stay in the imperial city he returned to Alexandria, and resumed his catechetical office, devolving the instruction of the less advanced students on Heraclas, while he reserved his own labours for those who were to be led into the full depths of his system of interpretation.^c It appears to have been about this time that he entered on the study of Hebrew—a language then commonly neglected by the learned men of the Alexandrian school,^d but attractive to Origen, not only as being generally useful towards the understanding of the Old Testament, but especially on account of the mysteries involved in Scriptural names.^e

The massacre of Alexandria under Caracalla drove him for a time from the city. He visited the Holy Land, where he was received with honour by his old fellow-student ^{A.D. 215.} Alexander bishop of Jerusalem, and by Theoctistus bishop of Cæsarea; and, although a layman, he was desired by them to preach in their churches. On hearing of this, Demetrius of Alexandria remonstrated, but Theoctistus and Alexander justified themselves by precedents which showed that laymen had been permitted to preach in the presence of bishops, and with their sanction. Demetrius, however, was offended; he summoned Origen to return to his duties in the catechetical school, and the deacons who conveyed the letter were charged to conduct him back.^f

^a Redep. i. 213-8, 231, 457-8.

^b Euseb. vi. 14; Hieron. de VV. Illustr. 54. It is to this visit that the composition of the *Philosophumena* was referred by the editor, M. Miller. See pp. 83, 85.

^c Euseb. vi. 15.

^d Hieron. de VV. Illustr. 54.

^e Orig. in Joann. t. vi. 24; Redep. i.

366. Philo had written on the Hebrew names of the Old Testament, and Origen performed a like labour for the New Testament.

^f Euseb. vi. 19; Mosh. 673. For the Alexandrian massacre (which was unconnected with any question of religion), see Gibbon, i. 144.

Among Origen's chief friends and admirers was a man of fortune named Ambrose, who had been converted by him from some form of Gnostic heresy, and afterwards became a deacon. Ambrose urged his teacher to engage in the illustration of Scripture, and supplied him with the funds necessary for forming a collection of MSS., and employing a large body of amanuenses and transcribers.^g Among the results of this munificence were the first regular commentaries on the sacred books (for the earlier expositions had been confined to particular texts or sections);^h and besides these, a work which entitles Origen to rank as the father of biblical criticism. The original object of his undertaking was polemical,—to ascertain the true text of the Septuagint, and to vindicate that version against the Jews, who, since the adoption and general use of it by Christians, had disparaged it as inferior to later translations. For this purpose Origen exhibited in parallel columns,—(1) the original Hebrew text; (2) the same in Greek letters; (3) the version by Aquila; (4) the version of Symmachus; (5) the Septuagint, edited from an elaborate collection of MSS.; and (6) the version of Theodotion. From its six columns the whole work was called *Hexapla*, and, from the addition of two imperfect versions in certain parts, it also had the name of *Octapla*. This gigantic labour appears to have been begun at Alexandria; it extended over eight-and-twenty years, and was completed only a short time before Origen's death.ⁱ The original MS., which was preserved at Cæsarea, is supposed to have perished in the destruction of the Cæsarean library by the Arabs, A.D. 653. It had never been transcribed as a whole; but separate copies of the various columns had been made, and that of the Septuagint became a standard.^k

In consequence of the reputation which Origen had attained, applications for instruction and advice were made to him from distant quarters. Thus, before his first visit to Palestine, he had been invited by a person of authority in Arabia—most probably a Roman governor, although some writers suppose him to have been the head of a native tribe—to teach his people the Christian faith, and had complied with the invitation.^l At a later time Mammæa, the mother of Alexander Severus, summoned him to Antioch, and conferred with him on religious subjects.^m In like manner he was

^g Euseb. vi. 23.

^h Redep. i. 379.

ⁱ Orig. Ep. ad African. 4, 5 (t. i. 16-7); Epiphan. lxiv. 3; Huet, III. ii. 4; Redep. i. 374; ii. 158; Gieseler, vi. 61-2.

^k Redep. ii. 177.

^l παρὰ τοῦ τῆς Ἀραβίας ἡγουμένου. Euseb. vi. 19. Mosheim (448) supposes him an Arab. See Neander, i. 112; Redep. i. 370; Clinton, A.D. 215.

^m Euseb. v. 21. By some writers the

requested, in the year 228, to visit Greece, for the confutation of some heresies which were disturbing the Church of that country.ⁿ He set out, bearing with him letters of commendation from his bishop, according to the practice of the time, and took his way through Palestine, where, at the age of forty-three, he was ordained presbyter by his friends Theoctistus and Alexander. In explanation of this it has been supposed that the bishops wished him to address their flocks, as on his former visit; that Origen reminded them of the objections then made by Demetrius; that, by way of guarding against further complaints, they offered to ordain him; and that he accepted the offer, in the belief that Demetrius, although determined not to raise him to the presbyterate like his predecessors Pantænus and Clement, would allow him to rank among the Alexandrian presbyters, if the order were conferred on him elsewhere by bishops of eminent station and character.^o After successfully accomplishing his business in Greece, Origen returned to Alexandria in 230; but in the mean time his ordination had given rise to much dispute. Demetrius, on being informed of it, vehemently expostulated with Alexander and Theoctistus, apprising them of the rash act of Origen's youthful zeal, which, by a canon^p perhaps even then extant, is pronounced a bar to ordination. The information was new to the bishops; for Origen had said nothing of the impediment. If the canon existed, it is possible that he may have been unacquainted with it; or he may have reasonably supposed himself to be exempt from its operation, since the object of it unquestionably was to check the fanatical spirit which prompted such acts, whereas he had long passed through the stage at which he had anything in common with that spirit.^q The proceedings of Demetrius have been attributed to envy of Origen's genius and fame;^r it is, however, not impossible that he may have acted from conscientious motives, although his conduct was marked by an unjustifiable violence and harshness.^s He had been glad to retain

date is placed in 217 or 218; by others, after Alexander's accession, about 223. See Pagi, ii. 293; Tillem. iii. 523-4, 763; Schröckh, iv. 32; Burton, ii. 273, 282; Redep. i. 372. Mr. Clinton's date is 226.

ⁿ Redep. i. 406-8; Clinton, A.D. 228.

^o Euseb. vi. 23; Mosh. 674-5; Tillem. iii. 526; Redep. i. 406-8. That the presbyterate, and even the episcopate, were then sometimes given to persons who had not passed through the lower grades, see Routh, Rel. Sac. iii. 73-4.

^p Can. Apostol. 21 (Hard. i. 13). See Beveridge, Cod. Can. II. iv. 2; v. Drey,

266-9. The first Nicene Canon was afterwards directed against such practices.

^q Tillem. iii. 506, 526-7; Mosh. 674; Neand. ii. 470; Redep. i. 452. In his commentary on St. Matthew (t. xv. 1-5) Origen treats the literal interpretation on which he had acted as an instance of the errors which would follow from an adherence to the letter of Scripture in some parts. Cf. c. Celsus, vii. 48.

^r Hieron. de Viris Illustr. c. 54.

^s Archd. Evans takes the side of Demetrius, ii. 44-7.

Origen's services as a teacher, but refused to acknowledge him as a presbyter.

In addition to the irregularity of his ordination, Origen had rendered himself obnoxious by some of his speculations. Finding his position at Alexandria uneasy, he withdrew to Cæsarea,^t and, after his departure, Demetrius assembled two synods, by which Origen was deprived of his office in the catechetical school, his

orders were annulled, and he was excommunicated as a
A.D. 231.

heretic.^u The result of these synods was communicated to the bishops of other countries. By the rules of Catholic communion the decisions of one church, in such matters, were usually received by the rest, without inquiry into the merits of the case: and thus the sentence against Origen was ratified at Rome and elsewhere, while it was disregarded in those countries which had especially felt his personal influence,—in Palestine, Phœnicia,

Arabia, and Achaia.^x Demetrius died soon after, and
A.D. 233.

was succeeded in the see by Heraclas; but no attempt was made by the new bishop to rescind the condemnation of his former teacher and colleague.^y

At Cæsarea, under the patronage of Theoctistus and Alexander, Origen found not only a refuge, but an opening for a distinguished career. As there was no institution like the Alexandrian school, he took the position of an independent philosophical teacher, and his instructions were sought, not only by Christians, but by many heathens. Among these the most celebrated were two brothers, natives of Pontus, named Theodore and Athenodore, who, having been led to visit Palestine by family circumstances, became hearers of Origen in philosophy and literature, and were gradually guided by him to the Christian faith.^z Both eventually

^t Walch, vii. 396-7. Eusebius gives no warrant for the statement of Tillemont (iii. 534), Mosheim (677), and others, that his withdrawal was secret. (Redep. i. 411.) The story, told by Epiphanius (lxiv. 2), of his having been obliged to withdraw in consequence of having offered incense to idols, is generally rejected—although Pagi (A.D. 251. 6), Pétau (Animadv. in Epiphan. p. 258), Noël Alexandre (vi. 257, seqq.), and Huet (I. ii. 13), maintain it. See Tillem. iii. 534, 766; Dupin, i. 146; Mosh. 610; Schröckh, iv. 35; Burton, ii. 298; Redep. i. 411.

^u Tillem. iii. 534; Mosh. 680; Neander, ii. 471-2; Gieseler, I. i. 314. Although it is incorrect to say, with some, that Origen was banished from Alexan-

dria, inasmuch as the Church had no power of inflicting that penalty, it was yet, for a person of his character, involved in exclusion from communion. Mosh. 678-80; Neand. ii. 471; Redep. i. 411.

^x Hieron. Ep. 33.

^y Euseb. vi. 26. See Huet, I. ii. 15, and De la Rue's note; Redep. i. 413. According to a story preserved by Photius (quoted in Döllinger's 'Hippol. u. Callistus,' p. 264, from Fontani, 'Novæ Eruditorum Deliciæ,' Florent. 1785) Origen returned to Alexandria on the death of Demetrius, but the unsoundness of his teaching obliged Heraclas again to eject him.

^z Euseb. vi. 30; Tillem. iii. 536.

became bishops. It is said that Theodore, who at his baptism had taken the name of Gregory, at entering on his diocese of Neocæsarea, in Pontus, found in it only seventeen Christians, and that at his death he left in it only seventeen heathens^a—a statement which may be taken as expressing in an exaggerated form a really signal course of successful labour. He afterwards became the subject of many marvellous tales, from which he received the name of *Thaumaturgus*, or *miracle-worker*.^b

The persecution of Maximin compelled Origen to take refuge in Cappadocia^c with Firmilian bishop of Cæsarea, who had been one of his pupils; and when it reached that country he was sheltered in the house of Juliana, a rich Christian virgin, where he discovered an important addition to his materials for the Hexapla—his protectress having inherited the library of Symmachus, an Ebionite translator of the Old Testament.^d On the death of Maximin he returned to Cæsarea. It was probably after this^e that he was invited to be present at a synod held in Arabia on account of Beryllus bishop of Bostra, who, although seemingly unconnected with the schools of Praxeas and Noëtus, had arrived at a doctrine similar to theirs—that in the unity of the Godhead there is no distinction of Persons; that the Son had no personality before his incarnation. The synod condemned the doctrine, but could not convince Beryllus; Origen, however, succeeded in proving to him the unsoundness of his view, and received the thanks of both parties.^f On another occasion he was summoned to combat the opinion of an Arabian sect which held that the soul as well as the body is dissolved at death, and will be restored to being at the resurrection.^g

In the persecution under Decius, Origen lost his steadfast friend Alexander of Jerusalem. He was himself imprisoned and cruelly tortured; and the effect of this treatment on a frame worn out by age, study, and sickness, hastened his death, which took place at Tyre about the year 255.^h

^a Greg. Nyssen. Vit. Greg. Thaumaturg. Opera, t. ii. pp. 977, 1006, ed. Paris, 1615.

^b Tillem. iv. 316, seqq.; Mosh. 603; Redep. ii. 13; Newman on Miracles, 126–132.

^c Hieron. de Viris Illustr. c. 54. There is, however, some doubt as to this. See Tillem. iii. 538, 770; Neander, ii. 476.

^d Euseb. vi. 17; Redep. ii. 14.

^e Redep. places the affair of Beryllus about 244 (ii. 79).

^f Euseb. vi. 33; Hieron. de VV. Illustr. 60; Redep. ii. 91–101; Dorner, i. 551.

^g So Eusebius states, vi. 37; see Mosheim, 718. Redep. (ii. 105) points out the difficulties of such a theory, and supposes that Eusebius is mistaken—that these heretics were really *psychopannychites*, i.e. that they maintained the sleep of the soul.

^h Eus. vi. 39; vii. 1. There is a story of his having lapsed in the persecution, which, although generally rejected, is believed by Pagi, ii. 603–9. His death

The great object of this eminent teacher was to harmonise Christianity with philosophy. He sought to combine in a Christian scheme the fragmentary truths scattered throughout other systems; to establish the Gospel in a form which should not present obstacles to the conversion of Jews, of Gnostics, and of cultivated heathens; and his errors arose from a too eager pursuit of this idea.ⁱ

His principles of interpreting Scripture have been already mentioned by anticipation.^k It was from him that the Alexandrian method received its completion. He distinguished in Scripture a threefold sense—the literal, the moral, and the mystical—answering respectively to the body, soul, and spirit in man.^l As at the marriage of Cana some waterpots contained two firkins and some three, so (he taught) Scripture in “every jot and tittle” has the moral and the mystical senses, and in most parts it has the literal also.^m The Holy Spirit, it was said, made use of the literal history where it was suitable for conveying the mystical sense; where this was not the case, He invented the story with a view to that purpose; and in the Law, while He laid down some things to be literally observed, other precepts were in their letter impossible or absurd. Thus, much of the letter of Scripture was rejected; but such passages, both in the Old and in the New Testament, were, according to Origen, set by the Holy Spirit as stumbling-blocks in the way, that the discerning reader, by seeing the insufficiency of the letter, might be incited to seek after the understanding of the spiritual meaning.ⁿ Such portions of Scripture were not the less Divine for their “mean and despicable” form; it was the fault of human weakness if men would not penetrate through this veil to the treasure which was hidden below. As, therefore, Origen denounced the Gnostic impiety of supposing the various parts of the Bible to have come from different sources, so he held it no less necessary to guard against the error of many Christians, who, while they acknowledged the same God in the Old and in the New Testament, yet ascribed to

is placed in 253 by Tillemont (iii. 548) and Clinton; in 254 by Neander (ii. 481) and Redepenning (ii. 266); in 256 by Pagi, iii. 38.

ⁱ Tillem. iii. 594; Mosh. 620, 635; Tzschirner, 371–3; Dorner, i. 635. Cf. Orig. c. Cels. vi. 2.

^k Pp. 89–91.

^l De Principiis, iv. 11; in Levitic. Hom. v. 5.

^m De Princ. iv. 12, 20; in Exod. Hom. i. 4.

ⁿ De Princ. 15–18. It is argued in ‘Tracts for the Times,’ No. 89, pp. 60, seqq., that Origen has been misinterpreted in many places where he seems to deny the truth of the Scriptural narrative. But if so, the charge against him is very little mitigated, since he wrote in a style which would suggest to ordinary minds the idea of his rejecting the letter, and which is only to be rescued by such extremely ingenious constructions as those in the Tract.

Him actions unworthy of the most cruel and unjust of men.^o It was (he said) through a carnal understanding of the letter that the Jews were led to crucify our Lord, and still to continue in their unbelief.^p Those who would insist on the letter were like the Philistines who filled up with earth the wells which Abraham's servants had digged; the mystical interpreter was, like Isaac, to open the wells.^q In justice to Origen, we must remember that the literal system of interpretation, as understood in his day, was something very different from the grammatical and historical exposition of modern times. It made no attempt to get over difficulties or to harmonise seeming discrepancies; and when applied to the explanation of prophecy, it embarrassed the advocates of orthodox Christianity and gave great advantages to their opponents. To get rid of it was, therefore, desirable with a view to the controversies with Jews and Montanists.^r

Whereas (it was said) the heathen philosophers addressed themselves exclusively to the more educated, Holy Scripture condescends to persons of every kind, according to their capacities;^s its narrative was "most wisely ordained," with a view both to the mass of simpler believers, and to the comparatively small number who should be desirous or able to inquire more deeply with understanding.^t The letter, therefore, was allowed to be sufficient for the unlearned;^u but, although in this opinion Origen resembled some of the Gnostic teachers, he was utterly opposed to their contempt for the less instructed brethren, and to their representation of whole classes of men as hopelessly shut out from the higher grades of understanding. Every one, he held, was bound to advance according to his means and opportunities. The literal sense might be understood by any attentive reader; the moral required higher intelligence; the mystical was only to be apprehended through the grace of the Holy Spirit, which was to be obtained by prayer; nor did Origen himself pretend to possess this grace in such a degree as would entitle him to claim any authority for his comments.^x Whereas Clement had spoken with fear of divulging his mystical interpretations, and had given them as traditional,^y Origen's are offered merely as his own, and his only fear is lest they should be wrong.^z Of the mystical sense, he held

^o Ibid. 7-9.

^p Mosh. 653-6; Redep. i. 302-3.

^q In Genes. Hom. xiii. 2.

^r Gieseler, I. i. 331; Redep. i. 300.

On the contrast between the plainness of moral teaching in the prophets and the obscurity of their predictions, see Orig. c. Celsum, vii. 10.

^s Cont. Cels. vii. 61.

^t Ib. iv. 49.

^u De Princ. iv. 12.

^x C. Cels. vii. 11; De Princip. i. 14; in Levit. Hom. v. 5, p. 210.

^y e. g. Stromata, I. i. p. 324; i. 12; vi. 7, p. 771.

^z De Princip. i. 6, &c.; Mosh. 633, 639, 645-7, 650-1, 653; Neand. ii

that there were two kinds—the *allegorical*, where the Old Testament prefigured the history of Christ and his Church; and the *anagogical*, where the narrative typified the things of a higher world. For, as St. Paul speaks of a “Jerusalem which is above,”^a Origen held the existence of a spiritual world in which everything of this earth has its antitype. And thus passages of Scripture, which in their letter he supposed to be fictitious, were to be regarded as shadowing forth realities of the higher world which earthly things could not sufficiently typify.^b

These principles of exposition were not laid down without cautions and safeguards as to their application; and in Origen himself they were controlled by a faithful, devout, and dutiful spirit. But it is evident that they tend to no less an evil than the subversion of all belief in the historical truth of Scripture.^c

There is a difficulty in ascertaining Origen's opinions on many points—not only from the obscurity of the subjects which he treats, but also because his remaining writings are in great part preserved only in translations which are known to be unfaithful.^d Even in his own lifetime he had to complain of falsifications by heretics, and of misrepresentation by indiscreet admirers,^e while he was conscious that prejudiced readers might be likely to misapprehend him as heretical.^f His soundness as to the highest of Christian doctrines has been much questioned; indeed, the Arians claimed him as a forerunner of their heresy.^g But St. Athanasius spoke of him with respect, explained his language, and vindicated him from misrepresentation. Bishop Bull, too, defends his orthodoxy; but even after the somewhat large postulate that he may be judged only by his treatise against Celsus^h—as being the most matured offspring of his mind, and the only one of his works which is not probably corrupted—our great theologian finds much exercise for his learning and ingenuity in drawing forth a Catholic sense from passages of questionable appearance.ⁱ

252-3, 262-3; Redep. i. 295, 302-3, 315-8, 336, 383.

^a Galat. iv. 26.

^b De Princ. iv. 20-2; c. Cels. iv. 21; Suicer, s. voc. ἀναγωγή; Mosh. 640-3; Redep. i. 290, 306-8, 313; ii. 343.

^c Neand. ii. 264, 269. See Evans, ii. 39-47, 105, sqq.

^d Blunt on the Fathers, 108; see below, book ii. c. 7.

^e Tom. i. pp. 5-6.

^f De Princ. I. vi. 1.

^g Epiphan. lxiv. 4.

^h This was composed at the instance of his friend Ambrose, during the reign of Philip, when the improved position of the Christians rendered it desirable that their cause should be maintained more fully and methodically than in the occasional Apologies of earlier writers. See the preface to the work; and above, p. 34.

ⁱ Bull. Def. Fid. Nic. lib. ii. c. 9. See as to Origen's opinions on the doctrines relating to the Godhead, Tillem. iii. 589; Mosh. 633; Burton's Anteni-

To Origen is due the invention of a term which, as happily expressing the traditional belief, has been adopted into the language of the Church—the “Eternal Generation” of the Logos. He illustrated the mode of this by a comparison with the emission of brightness from light. It was not, he said, a thing which had taken place once for all, but is ever continued in the “everlasting now” of the Divine existence.^k

His doctrines as to the creation were very singular. Rejecting the Gnostic view, which supposed matter independent of God, he maintained that, as God is omnipotent and Lord, He must always have had something on which to exercise his power and dominion; and consequently that the work of creation from nothing must have been eternal.^l The object of this theory was to reconcile the Mosaic narrative with the Platonic notion that the world had eternally emanated from God. There had (he taught) been multitudes of worlds before the present, and there would yet be multitudes after its end^m—the nearness of which he supposed to be indicated by the fact of our Lord’s having already appeared in the flesh.ⁿ The number of souls originally created was final; there had been no additions to it, but the same souls continually reappeared in an endless variety of forms.^o All were at first perfect, and were endued with freedom of will.^p By abuse of this they contracted a guilt which required purgation; hence the worlds were created that the beings who had sinned might be awakened to a sense of their estrangement from God and to a craving after blessedness—that they might be purified through conflict for restoration to their first estate.^q The disobedient souls were treated according to the measure of their offence. Those which had least sinned became angels, living in the planets, and occupied in works of ministry for men; the worst of all became devils;^r while, for such as were confined in bodies of flesh, the whole complication of their being and circumstances was arranged in proportion as they had sinned more or less grievously. Some, however, were plunged deeper than the degree of their guilt had deserved, in order that

cene Testimonies to the Divinity of Christ, ed. 2, pp. 281-3; Gieseler, I. i. 324-6; vi. 141-5; Redep. ii. 44; Evans, ii. 90.

^k De Princ. I. ii. 4, 7; Petav. de Trin. V. ix. 6-7; Dorner, i. 644-8; Redep. ii. 301.

^l De Princ. I. ii. 10; Mosh. 613; Redep. ii. 292.

^m For this he cited Heb. ix. 26, ἐπι συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων; also Isaiah lxvi.

2; Eccles. i. 9. De Princ. II. iii. 5; III. v. 9. ⁿ Ib. III. v. 6.

^o Ib. II. ix. 1; Neander, ii. 284-5.

^p De Princ. i. 5; iii. 1.

^q Ib. i. 6-7; II. ix. 8. He says that the reasonable soul (νοῦς) when cooled down from the Divine warmth, becomes ψυχὴ; and this, when restored, will again become νοῦς. Ib. II. viii. 3.

^r Ib. I. vi. 2-3; viii. 4; III. vi. 3; Huet, II. v.

they might help in the instruction and deliverance of their fellows;^s and thus Origen supposes that the death of a righteous man may have a redeeming effect for others.^t He divided mankind into carnal, psychical, and spiritual, but instead of supposing, like the Gnostics, that each man was immovably fixed in a particular class,^u he maintained that all were originally alike, that the differences between them arose from the exercise of their free will, and that none were unchangeably good or bad. He allowed Adam to be a historical person—the first of the sinful spirits who was embodied in flesh; but, like Philo,^x he regarded the history of the Fall as an allegory.^y One soul only there was which had not sinned. This, by continual contemplation of the Divine Logos, had adhered to Him or been absorbed in Him; and thus it had made the way for that union of Godhead with a material body which but for such a medium would have been impossible.^z As the Gospel was adapted to men of every kind, so our Lord's appearance while on earth varied according to the characters of those who beheld Him.^a

Origen's views as to the mediatorial work of the Saviour are difficult to understand, and no less so to reconcile with orthodox belief. He considers the death on the Cross as representing something which is spiritually repeated in the higher world, and which has its effect towards the deliverance of the angels.^b He allows that, in order to become or to remain good, grace is necessary as well as free-will;^c but he appears to have erred in allowing too much to the ordinary powers with which he supposed our nature to be endowed.^d

All punishment, he holds, is merely corrective and remedial, being ordained in order that all creatures may be restored to their original perfection.^e At the resurrection all mankind will have to pass through a fire:^f the purged spirits will enter into paradise, a place of training for the consummation;^g the wicked will remain in the "fire," which, however, is not described as material, but as a mental misery. The matter and food of it, he says, are our sins,

^s De Princ. II. ix. 7.

^t Exhort. ad Martyr. 50 (t. i. p. 309); Mosh. 626-7.

^u De Princ. I. viii. 3; II. ix. 5-6.

^x De Mundi Opif. t. i. 38, ed. Mangey.

^y De Princ. iv. 16.

^z Ib. II. vi. 3-7; Dorner, i. 680.

^a C. Cels. ii. 64; iv. 15-6. Origen professed to derive this notion from tradition. In Matth. xxxv. 100.

^b De Princ. iv. 25. See Huet, II. iii. 20 seqq.; Evans, ii. 97.

^c See De Princ. III. i. 19; Huet, II. vii. 10; De la Rue, n. on Huet, t. iv. Append. 192-5; Mosh. 626, 666; Neander, ii. 368, 386; Redep. ii. 400-3.

^d Nat. Alex. vi. 287; Evans, ii. 99-100.

^e De Princ. I. vi.; II. 1.

^f Ib. II. ix. 6; in Exod. Hom. vi. 4; in Luc. Hom. xiv. p. 948; Huet, II. ii. 11. 1.

^g De Princ. II. xi. 6.

which, when swollen to the height, are inflamed to become our punishment; and the "outer darkness" is the darkness of ignorance.^h But the condition of these spirits is not without hope, although thousands of years may elapse before their suffering shall have wrought its due effect on them.ⁱ On the other hand, those who are admitted into paradise may abuse their free-will, as in the beginning, and may consequently be doomed to a renewal of their sojourn in the flesh.^k Every reasonable creature—even Satan himself—may be turned from evil to good, so as not to be excluded from salvation.^l At the final consummation the soul will dwell in a glorified organ, of which the germ is in the present body.^m Its pleasures will be purely spiritual; the saints will understand all the mysteries of Providence and of the ordinances given by God to Israel.ⁿ Love, which "never faileth," will preserve the whole creation from the possibility of any further fall; and "God will be all in all."^o

The reputation of Origen has had vehement assailants and earnest defenders.^p Certain propositions ascribed to him were condemned, and an anathema was attached to his name, by a synod held at Constantinople in the sixth century;^q and it may perhaps be thought that the mischief of any particular errors in doctrine is far exceeded by that of the perverse method of interpreting Scripture, which owed to him its completeness and much of its popularity. But, with whatever abatements on the ground of his

^h Ib. II. x. 4, 18; c. Cels. v. 15 seqq.; Blunt on the Fathers, 129.

ⁱ De Princ. I. vi. 3. He held that αἰὼν meant a limited time, and that, consequently, αἰῶνες τῶν αἰώνων must be finite. See Huet, II. ii. 11. 26.

^k Ib. II. iii. 3; III. vi. 3 (in Jerome's version).

^l It has been often said that Origen maintained the salvation of the devil, and it appears to be involved in the consistency of his system (Neander, i. 472). All however, that he seems really to have asserted was, that Satan *might* turn and be saved, while at the same time he held that, from his rooted wickedness, he *would* not turn. (De Princ. I. vi. 3; in Rom. l. viii. 9; Huet, II. v. 12.) In his letter to Alexander (t. i. p. 9) he declares the opinion imputed to him to be something which not even a madman could uphold. He was anxious to keep some of his doctrines from the vulgar; e.g. that of the non-eternity of punishment (c. Cels. iii. 79; viii. 52); and for this

purpose he sanctioned equivocation, or even falsehood. (Hieron. c. Rufin. i. 18; Gieseler, I. i. 320; Redep. ii. 317.) See, however, his answer to the charge brought by Celsus against Christian teachers, that they deceived the vulgar with false exoteric doctrines, iv. 10.

^m De Princ. II. 2; ix. 3; xii.; III. vi. 4-6; c. Cels. v. 15, seqq. Origen's doctrine of a spiritual body, founded on St. Paul's illustration of the seed and the plant (1 Cor. xv.) was misunderstood and censured by some, as if he denied the resurrection. See Hieron. c. Joann. Hierosol. 25 seqq.; Huet, II. ii. 9; Evans, ii. 110.

ⁿ De Princ. II. xi. 5, 7.

^o In Rom. l. v. c. 10 (t. iv. p. 568); De Princ. III. vi. 1-3.

^p See Bull, Def. Fid. Nic. II. i. 1; Huet, II. iii.; IV. i. 4-6.

^q A local synod, in 544, not (as was long believed) the fifth General Council, A.D. 553. Gieseler, I. ii. 368, 372. Neander, iv. 481-2. See book II. c. 12.

errors—however strong may be our sense of the evil which his system produced, or was fitted to produce, in the hands of others—we must think of Origen himself as a man who not only devoted all the energies of his mind during a long life to what he conceived to be the truth, but believed his views of truth to be consistent with the traditional faith of the Church. His peculiar opinions arose (as has been already said) from a wish to overcome the supposed incompatibility of philosophy with the Gospel; he desired in all things to hold fast the foundation of essential Christian doctrine; he proposed his own speculations with modesty, and claimed for them no higher character than that of probable conjectures.^r His piety is as unquestioned as the greatness of his genius and the depth of his learning; he suffered much for the Gospel, and may, indeed, almost be reckoned as a martyr. While he lived he was the chief opponent of heresy in all its varieties; the multitude of converts whom he brought over to the Church from heathenism, Judaism, and corrupted forms of Christianity, is a noble testimony no less to his earnestness and love than to his controversial ability. We may, therefore, well say with the candid Tillemont,^s that, although such a man might hold heretical opinions, he could not be a heretic, since he was utterly free from that spirit which constitutes the guilt of heresy.

II. Among the most distinguished of Origen's pupils was Dionysius, who succeeded Heraclas, first in the catechetical school (A.D. 232), and afterwards in the see of Alexandria (A.D. 248). This eminent man, after having been brought up as a heathen, was led to embrace Christianity by a perusal of St. Paul's Epistles. As he continued after his ordination to read the works of heathens and heretics, a presbyter remonstrated with him on the dangerous nature of such studies, and Dionysius was impressed by the remonstrance; but he was reassured by a vision or dream, in which he heard a voice saying to him, "Read whatsoever may fall into thy hands; for thou art able to read with discernment, and to reject what is worthless, since it was even thus that thou wert first brought to the faith."^t

Dionysius was not more admirable for his learning than for his

^r Mosh. 607, 628-9; Dorner, i. 637; Redep. ii. 115.

^s iii. 495-8, 595; comp. Newman on Arianism, 108-110.

^t Dion. Alex. ap. Euseb. vii. 7. The

reading of heathen books is forbidden in the Apostolical Constitutions, i. 6. See Coteler's note; also Cassian, Collat. xiv. 12, and the note.

wisdom and moderation. His name will repeatedly come before us in connexion with the affairs of the Church; but two controversies in which he took part may be here particularly mentioned.

(1.) About the year 257, the Libyan Pentapolis, the native country of Sabellius, was greatly disturbed by his heresy,^u and the matter came under the official notice of the Egyptian primate. Dionysius combated the Sabellian errors both in conference and by writing;^x but unhappily he used some expressions which gave a pretext for charging him with opinions resembling those afterwards broached by Arius, as if he had denied the Eternal Sonship. His language was reported to the bishop of Rome as heretical—not that any jurisdiction over Alexandria was supposed to belong to Rome, but because the matter was one of common concern; because in proportion to the eminence of a bishop's see it was his duty to investigate and to act in such cases; and because the first of bishops was the person to whom complaints against the second were most naturally carried.^y On this, the bishop of Rome, who was also named Dionysius, held a council, and requested an explanation; and Dionysius of Alexandria, disregarding, for the sake of peace and unity, all that might have excited his jealousy in such an interference, replied by a satisfactory vindication of his orthodoxy.^z

(2.) The doctrine of Chiliasm or Millennarianism is styled in the first Articles of the Reformed English Church “a Jewish dotage;”^a but, although no doubt derived from Judaism, it must not be considered as indicative of a Jewish tendency. There was, indeed, in common with Judaism, the belief that the Messiah would reign personally on earth, that his kingdom would have Jerusalem for its seat, and that it would last a thousand years; but (besides other important differences,—as that the Jewish millennium was expected to follow immediately on the Messiah's

^u This has been usually regarded as the first outbreak of Sabellianism; and it has in consequence been supposed that Novatian's work ‘De Trinitate,’ which mentions Sabellius (c. 12), must have been written after its author had left the Church. But Lumper argues (ap. Migne, *Patrologia*, iii. 872-3) that the circumstance which occurred in 257 was a movement of Sabellius' followers, and places the heresiarch himself under Alexander Severus—a view for which he mentions other authorities. We have seen (p. 85) that a still earlier date

ought to be given for the rise of the heresy.

^x Athanas. de *Sententia Dionysii*, 5, 9.

^y See Schröckh, iv. 174; Routh, *Rel. Sac.* iii. 380.

^z Dion. Alex. ap. Athan. de *Decr. Syn. Nic.* c. 25; Dion. Rom. ib. 26; Ath. de *Sent. Dion.* 13, seqq.; Tillem. iv. 279-283; Dorner, i. 742-4; 748-752. See Bp. Bull. *Def. Fid. Nic.* ii. 11, who remarks (§ 7) that the excitement raised by the mere suspicion of Arianising proves how alien Arian doctrines were from the mind of Dionysius' age.

^a Articles of Edw. VI. No. xli.

first appearance, whereas the Christians looked to His *second* coming) the Christian Chiliasm showed no favour to the fleshly Israel, nor even to its holy city; for the new Jerusalem was to come down from heaven, and to take the place of the earthly, which was to perish.^b

The chiliastic opinions were very early professed. Among their advocates is said to have been Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, a hearer of the Apostle St. John;^c and by the end of the second century they appear to have become general in the Church,^d recommended as they were by their offering a ground of opposition to pagan Rome, and affording a near consolation to the faithful in persecutions and trials.^e

The doctrine was embraced by the Montanists with great ardour, and became a characteristic of their sect. This circumstance, however, tended to bring Chiliasm into discredit with the orthodox; and other causes contributed to its decline. The idealising and spiritualising tendencies of the Alexandrian school, which came into vigour about the same time, were strongly opposed to the literalism on which the chiliastic opinions rested; and, moreover, the doctrine was found a hindrance to the conversion of Greeks and Romans, as being offensive to their national feelings. For such reasons it had for many years been sinking.^f

The persecution of Decius may have tended to revive its popularity among those who felt the approach of suffering for the faith.^g Nepos, an Egyptian bishop, had written a chiliastic book, entitled a 'Refutation of the Allegorists;' and about the year 255—Nepos himself being then dead—it was reported that his opinions had found many converts in the district of Arsinoë. Dionysius, on hearing of the matter, behaved with his characteristic prudence; he went to the spot, requested a conference with the Millenarian party, and spent three days in discussing with them the book of Nepos, of whom he was careful to speak with great respect and affection. The result was, that, whereas a different course might have urged them into schism, he succeeded in convincing them, and was warmly thanked by their leader, Coracion;^h and from this time Chiliasm, although it still had

^b Dorner, i. 241. See Orig. de Princ. II. xi. 2; c. Cels. iv. 22.

^c Euseb. iii. 39. It has, however, been suggested that Eusebius may have misunderstood words which Papias used in an allegorical sense. See Pitra, Spicileg. Solesm. i. Prolegg. p. v.

^d See Burton, B. L., note 76; Pusey in Tertullian, i. 116–130.

^e Tzschirner, 606.

^f Mosh. 721; Neander, ii. 396.

^g Gieseler, I. i. 334.

^h Euseb. vii. 24.

adherents, and in the next century found a champion in Apollinarius, of Laodicea,ⁱ was little heard of in the Eastern Church.^k

III. As the name of Origen is famous in the history of doctrine, that of his contemporary Cyprian^l is no less so in connexion with the government and discipline of the Church. Cyprian was born at Carthage or in its neighbourhood about the year 200,^m and, after having been distinguished as a teacher of rhetoric, he embraced Christianity in mature age.ⁿ His earlier life had not been free from the usual impurities of heathen morals,^o although perhaps the abhorrence with which he spoke of it, when viewing it by the light of the Gospel, may give an exaggerated idea of the degree in which he had been stained by them.^p On his conversion, and probably while yet a catechumen, he displayed his zeal by selling a villa and gardens, which he possessed near Carthage, and devoting the price, with a large portion of his other property, to the relief of the poor.^q His deacon and biographer, Pontius, however, tells us that these gardens were afterwards restored to him "by the indulgence of God,"—most probably through the instrumentality of his friends.^r At his baptism, Cyprian added to his old name, Thascius, that of Cæcilius, in remembrance of a presbyter who had influenced his conversion.^s He was rapidly promoted to the offices of deacon and presbyter;^t and, on a

ⁱ Epiphan. lxxvii. 26-8. For Apollinarius see Book ii. chap. iv., near the end.

^k Gieseler, I. i. 334, ii. 91-2. In the west it was common until the time of Constantine. Ibid. vi. 238.

^l The truth of St. Cyprian's history, and the genuineness of the epistles ascribed to him and his correspondents, have, with many other things in Christian antiquity, been assailed by the Rev. E. J. Shepherd, in his 'History of the Church of Rome' (London, 1851), with great vehemence, but in a style of criticism which seems to me altogether arbitrary and unreasonable. I have examined this portion of his work in the 'Quarterly Review' for June, 1853, and have noticed such parts of his reply as appeared to require any notice in the 'Journal of Sacred Literature' for October, 1856.

^m Rettberg, 'Thascius Cæcilius Cyprianus, Bischof von Carthago,' Götting. 1831.

ⁿ A.D. 245, Maran, 'Vita S. Cypr.' ap. Migne, 79-80; A.D. 246, Pearson, 'Annales Cyprianici,' ap. Fell, 6.

^o It was formerly said that he practised magic as a means towards gratifying his passions (Greg. Naz. Orat. xxiv. 8.

seqq.). Then it was shown that this statement applied to a bishop of Antioch, named Cyprian, who is said to have been martyred under Diocletian (Tillem. v. 329, seqq.). But there can be little doubt that this Syrian (the Cyprian of Calderon's 'Magico Prodigioso') is a fabulous person—a legendary reflection of the great African martyr. (See Maran, 75-6; Schröckh, iv. 236; vii. 95; Rettberg, 25-9.) It is a curious circumstance that the Anglican calendar commemorates St. Cyprian on a wrong day. Before the Reformation, the celebration of the English St. Edith excluded that of SS. Cornelius and Cyprian on September 16, but the eastern Cyprian was celebrated on September 26. The name of Cyprian, without any designation, was attached to the latter day in the calendar of 1551; and the title "Archbishop of Carthage and Martyr" was added in 1662. See Daniel, Codex Liturgicus, iii. 338-9. Lips. 1851.

^p Neander, i. 309; Rettb. 25.

^q Pontius 'de Vita et Passione S. Cypr.' c. 3.

^r C. 15; Neander, i. 310.

^s Pontius, c. 5.

^t Pearson, 8. Some writers, however

vacancy in the see of Carthage, within three years after his conversion, he was elected bishop by the general desire of the people—his signal merit being regarded as a warrant for dispensing with the apostolical warning against the promotion of recent converts,^u as well as for overruling his unwillingness to undertake the responsibility of such a charge.^x Five presbyters, however, were opposed to his election; and, notwithstanding his attempts to conciliate them, they continued to regard him with a settled ill-feeling.

Cyprian entered on his episcopate with an earnest resolution to correct the abuses and disorders which he found prevailing among his flock;^y but after two years, his labours for this purpose were interrupted by the persecution under Decius. At Carthage, as elsewhere in that persecution, the bishop was especially aimed at; the heathen populace clamoured that he should be thrown to the lions; and Cyprian—not from fear, but in consequence (as he states) of a heavenly warning, and from a conviction that such a course was most for the benefit of his Church—withdrawn to a retreat at no great distance, where he remained about fourteen months. His property was confiscated on his disappearance.^z

The unworthy behaviour of Christians in this persecution has already been mentioned.^a Besides those who actually sacrificed to the heathen gods, multitudes, by a payment to the magistrates, obtained certificates of having obeyed the emperor's commands; and many of these, who were called *Libellatici*, persuaded themselves, by an ignorant sort of casuistry, that they had done nothing wrong.^b The troubles of the Carthaginian Church were increased by a practice which originated in the high regard entertained for martyrs and confessors. From a natural feeling of respect for those who shed their blood for the faith, martyrs had been allowed, perhaps as early as the middle of the second century, to recommend for favourable consideration the cases of persons who were under ecclesiastical censure.^c This was originally the extent of their privilege, and it had been customary that the deacons should visit the martyrs in prison, for the purpose of

(as Bingham, II. x. 7), suppose him to have been raised to the episcopate *per saltum*.

^u 1 Tim. iii. 15.

^x Pontius, 7; Pearson, 9; Maran, 79–80.

^y Rettberg, 45–52.

^z Pontius, 7; Cyp. Epp. 16, 20. Perhaps Cyprian's words need not mean

that he had any other divine warning than the text Matt. x. 23. See notes by Dr. Newman in St. Cyp. Treatises, pp. viii. 159, Oxf. 1839.

^a P. 97.

^b Mosh. 485; Neander, i. 182.

^c See Tertull. ad Martyres, 6; De Pudic. 22.

suggesting caution in the distribution of their favours.^d But abuses had grown up in the course of years, and some daring novelties of this kind were now introduced at Carthage.^e One Lucian, inflated by the reputation which he had gained as a confessor, professed that a martyr named Paul had, in right of his martyrdom, bequeathed to him the power of granting readmission to the communion of the Church. Tickets were made out in such a form as to be available, not only for the person named in them, but for an indefinite number of others;^f indulgences of this kind were distributed without limit, and even became a matter of traffic. The holders noisily insisted on immediate restoration to full communion; some bishops yielded to their importunity;^g and Lucian, in the name of all the confessors, wrote an insolent letter to Cyprian, announcing that they had granted reconciliation to all the lapsed, and desiring the bishop to convey the information to his episcopal brethren.^h

Cyprian from his retreat kept up a constant communication with his Church, and endeavoured to check these disorders, while, at the same time, he showed an anxious desire to avoid interference with such privileges as might reasonably be supposed to belong to martyrs and confessors. He allowed that those among the lapsed who had letters might be admitted to reconciliation, if in danger of death; but he directed that the rest should be reserved for an examination of their cases after his return to Carthage, and that in the mean time they should be exhorted to patience.ⁱ

A short time after Easter, 251, the bishop returned to his city, and held a council on the subject of the lapsed. It was agreed that such libellatics as had been penitent should be forthwith admitted to communion, and that those who had sacrificed should be allowed to hope for admission after a longer period of penance.^k The latter class received a further indulgence in the following year, when, in the prospect of a renewed persecution, a synod under Cyprian resolved to grant immediate reconciliation to all who had shown themselves duly penitent.^l

Fresh commotions were excited at Carthage by a presbyter named Novatus. It is uncertain whether this man was one of

^d Cyp. Ep. 15; Nat. Alex. vi. 106, seqq.; Tillem. iv. 69-70; Mosh. 489-491.

^e The 25th Canon of the Council of Eliberis (A.D. 305?) and the 9th of the Council of Arles (A.D. 314) are directed against some abuses which then continued to be made of letters from con-

fessors. See below, p. 149, note ^q.

^f "Communicet ille cum suis." Cyp. Ep. 15.

^g Cyp. Ep. 19, 27, &c.

^h Ep. 27.

ⁱ Ibid. 19, 23, &c.; Tillem. iv. 69-71, 75-6.

^k Ep. lv. 17.

^l Ep. 57.

the five presbyters who had objected to Cyprian's promotion;^m but he had become noted for his insubordination and irregularities. Cyprian tells us that he had robbed widows and orphans, and had embezzled the funds of the Church; that he had kicked his wife while pregnant, so as to cause the death of the child; that he had allowed his father to starve in the street,ⁿ and had refused even to bury him; and that for these and other offences he was about to be brought to trial, when the outbreak of persecution under Decius put a stop to the proceedings. Novatus entered into a connexion with Felicissimus, a man of wealth, but of indifferent character, and, either by usurping the episcopal power of ordination, or (as is more likely) by the assistance of some bishop, advanced him to the order of deacon.^o These two, with others of the clergy, engaged in a course of strong opposition to Cyprian; they incited the lapsed against him; they disputed with his commissioners as to the distribution of the Church-funds; and at

length, about a year after the bishop's return,^p May, 252. Felicissimus proceeded to set up one of the malcontent presbyters, Fortunatus, as a rival in the see of Carthage—the consecration being performed by five bishops, who had all been deprived for heresy or lapse.^q Novatus, in the mean time, had crossed the Mediterranean to Rome.

Fabian, bishop of Rome, was martyred in January, 250, and the see remained vacant until June in the following year, when Cornelius was elected.^r During this interval some letters were exchanged between Cyprian and the Roman clergy, who had been led by reports to think unfavourably of his withdrawal from his city, but afterwards came to understand him better, and agreed with him as to the course which should be pursued towards the lapsed. Among these clergy Novatian was eminent for eloquence and learning. He had received a philosophical education, although it is perhaps a mistake to infer from some of Cyprian's expressions that he was ever professedly a Stoic.^s His temper was morose and gloomy; he had at one time been vexed by a devil—for so the early Christians accounted for appearances which were probably like those of a diseased melancholy. After this he had

^m Pearson and Mosheim (508-9) suppose that he was not; Tillemont (iv. 613), Neander (i. 313), and Rettberg (103-5), that he was.

ⁿ Or in a village—"In vico." Ep. 49.

^o Ibid. See Pearson, 25; Bingham, II. iii. 7.

^p Pearson, 35.

^q Ep. lix. 10; Schröckh, iv. 299.

^r Pearson, 17, 28. Decius is said to have declared that he would rather see a pretender to the empire arise than a new bishop of Rome. Cypr. Ep. lii. 9.

^s Ep. lv.; Walch, ii. 194; Neander, i. 333.

received clinical baptism,^t and on his recovery had neglected to seek the completion of the baptismal gift by imposition of the bishop's hands; yet notwithstanding these irregularities, Fabian, from a wish to secure for the Church the services of so able a man, had admitted him to the priesthood—having with difficulty overcome the reluctance which was shown by all the clergy and by a large portion of the laity; for both clergy and people had then a voice in the selection of persons to be ordained.^u In the time of the persecution, when urged to take a share in ministering to his suffering brethren, Novatian is said to have answered that he “had no mind to be any longer a presbyter, and was attached to a different philosophy”—words which seem to indicate that he preferred a recluse ascetic life to the active labours of his office.^x

During the vacancy of the see Novatian had great influence at Rome. Cyprian states^y that he was the writer of a letter^z in which the Roman clergy allowed that the lapsed might be reconciled to the Church, if in danger of death; but after the election of Cornelius he became the leader of a schismatical party on principles incompatible with any such concession. He held that, although the penitent lapsed might be admitted to the Divine mercy, and therefore ought to be exhorted to repentance, yet the Church had no power to grant them absolution, and must for ever exclude them from communion; that a Church which communicated with such offenders forfeited its Christian character and privileges.^a

^t *i.e.* baptism on a sick bed—which was regarded with disfavour on account of the unworthy motives which commonly influenced the receivers in deferring their baptism until they might suppose themselves beyond the risk of forfeiting the grace of the sacrament by a relapse into sin. See chap. VIII. sect. iii. The Council of Neocæsarea, A.D. 314, forbids the ordination of a person so baptised to the presbyterate, unless he should have afterwards distinguished himself by faith and zeal, or unless the scarcity of other candidates should render the ordination expedient. c. 12.

^u Cornelius ap. Euseb. vi. 43; Tillem. iii. 437; Baluz. n. in Cypr. col. 317. Walch (ii. 197) supposes that it was not Fabian, but an earlier bishop, who ordained Novatian.

^x Cornel. l. c.; Neander, i. 332. This seems to be a more probable construction of the words than that proposed by Mosheim (p. 516)—that Novatian was disposed to leave the Church, which, according to Mosheim's view, he had entered without full conviction. Arch-

deacon Evans thinks that the story, if in any degree true, is much distorted, as it appears inconsistent with the fact that Novatian soon after took a leading part in the Roman Church. ii. 259.

^y Ep. lv. 5.

^z Ap. Cypr. Ep. 36.

^a Ibid. lv. 26-9; Socrat. iv. 28; Tillem. iii. 472; Walch, ii. 253-5. Neander, who never willingly admits any fault in a schismatic or reputed heretic, tries to defend Novatian's consistency (i. 334). But, in truth, all the leading persons would seem to have somewhat altered their views in the course of these affairs. The agreement between Cyprian and Cornelius resulted from an abatement on the part of the African, and an opposite movement on the part of the Roman (Neand. i. 315; Rettberg, 113-6). And Novatian probably was led by Cornelius's previous character to take his election for a token of a policy more lax than that which the bishop actually followed, while Novatian's own opinions had in the mean time become more severe.

Novatian had before protested that he did not desire the bishoprick of Rome, and we need not suppose his protest insincere, as his severe and unsocial temperament inclined him to a life of seclusion. When, however, the schism was formed, he allowed himself to be set up as its head, and was consecrated by three bishops of obscure sees, who had been drawn to Rome on false pretences, and laid their hands on him in the evening, after a meal. The moving spirit in these proceedings was the Carthaginian, Novatus.^b Possibly he may have disagreed with his old ally Felicissimus as to the treatment of the lapsed; or he may have taken the part of laxity at Carthage, and that of severity at Rome, from no better motive than a wish by either means to oppose the authority of the regular bishops.^c

Novatian sent notice of his consecration to the great churches of Carthage, Antioch, and Alexandria. Fabius of Antioch was inclined to acknowledge him, but died soon after, without having taken any decided measures.^d The letter to Dionysius of Alexandria appears to have been apologetic, representing that Novatian had been forced into his course; Dionysius replied that, if it were so, he ought to show his sincerity by withdrawing, and endeavouring to heal the breach.^e At Carthage the schismatical envoys were repelled by a council which was sitting at the time of their arrival.^f One Maximus was afterwards set up as Novatianist bishop of Carthage, and intruders of the same kind were planted in other African dioceses.^g

A large number of the Roman confessors had at first been engaged in the schism. These soon discovered their error; they formally acknowledged Cornelius as bishop, and returned to the unity of the Church,^h while Novatian endeavoured to secure the allegiance of his followers by requiring them, at the reception of the Eucharist, to swear that they would never forsake him or join Cornelius.ⁱ Novatianism found many proselytes in the west, and its principles became even more rigid than at first. The sentence of lifelong exclusion from communion, which had originally been applied only to those who had denied the faith,^k was afterwards extended to all who, after baptism, committed the greater sins. The Novatianists assumed the name of *Cathari*, or *Puritans*. They rebaptised proselytes from the Church, considering its communion to

^b Cornel. ap. Euseb. vi. 43. The Greek writers call Novatian *Novatus* (Νοβάτος).

^c See Tillem. iii. 449; Mosh. 504, 511, 518; Walch, ii. 230; Rettberg, 107-111; Neander, i. 337; Gieseler, I. i. 392.

^d Euseb. vi. 44; Tillem. iii. 463.

^e Euseb. vi. 45.

^f Cyp. Ep. 44.

^g Cyp. Ep. lix. 10; Tillem. iv. 107-8.

^h Cyp. Ep. 49.

ⁱ Cornel. ap. Euseb. vi. 43.

^k See Cyp. Ep. lv. 26.

be impure, and its ministrations to be consequently void. Some of them condemned second marriages as equally sinful with adultery.¹ As to the chief doctrines of the Gospel, the Novatianists were steadily orthodox, and many of them suffered for the faith. The Council of Nicæa attempted to heal the schism by conciliatory measures;^m but the Novatianists still regarded A. D. 325. the laxity of the Church's discipline as a bar to a reunion with it, although they were drawn into more friendly relations with the Catholics by a community of danger during the ascendancy of Arianism. The sect long continued to exist. In Phrygia, it combined with the remnant of the Montanists;ⁿ and at Alexandria, a patriarch^o found occasion to write against it so late as the end of the sixth century.

The opposite movement at Carthage was altogether a failure. Felicissimus in vain endeavoured to get his bishop acknowledged at Rome.^p Most of the Lapsed, who had adhered to him in the hope of gaining easy readmission in a body to the Church, were shocked at the establishment of a formal schism, and sued for reconciliation on Cyprian's terms.^q We hear nothing further of Felicissimus.

The great plague which has been already mentioned drew forth a signal display of Cyprian's charity and practical energy, and of those manifestations of Christian zeal and love which, wherever they took place, were found perhaps the most effective popular evidence in behalf of the faith which prompted them. While the heathen population of Carthage left their sick untended, and cast out the bodies of the dead into the streets—while all seemed to be hardened in selfishness, and wretches even invaded the houses

¹ Epiphanius, l. ix. 3-6; Theodoret, Hæc. iii. 5.

^m Can. viii. enacts that Novatianist clergy shall, on professing adhesion to the discipline of the Church as to communion with digamists and the lapsed, be admitted by imposition of hands, and allowed to retain their rank; and it provides for cases of conflicting claims by ordering that employment should be provided for the Novatianist bishops as *chorepiscopi* (see chap. viii.) or as presbyters, unless the Catholic bishops should be pleased to share the episcopal title with them. Socrates tells (i. 10) a story of Acesius, a Novatianist bishop, who had been invited to attend the Council. Constantine asked him whether he assented to its creed and to its determination respecting the time of Easter; to which Acesius answered that

both were in accordance with what he had always held as matter of apostolical tradition. The emperor then asked why he remained separate from the Church; on which the bishop stated the rigid notions of his sect as to the forgiveness of sins. Constantine rejoined by desiring him to "take a ladder, and go up to heaven by himself."

ⁿ Socrates, iv. 28; v. 21-2; Gieseler, I. i. 394. Socrates, who is favourable to the Novatianists (although probably not himself a member of the sect), complains that at Rome and Alexandria they were oppressed by the Catholic bishops in the beginning of the fifth century—having until then flourished, at Rome especially. vii. 7, 11.

^o Eulogius, the contemporary of Gregory the Great. Dupin, v. 94.

^p Cyprian, Ep. 59.

^q Ep. lix. 15.

of the dying for the purpose of plunder—and while the multitude reviled the Christians as having drawn down the visitation by their impiety towards the gods—Cyprian called his flock together, exhorted them by precepts and examples from Scripture, and appointed to each his work. The rich gave their money and the poor gave their labour towards the common object; the dead bodies which tainted the air were buried; and the sick, whether Christians or pagans, were nursed at the expense and by the care of Christians.^r

A fresh controversy soon arose to engage the attention of Cyprian. Cornelius died or was martyred^s in September, 252; and, after the Roman see had been held for less than eight months by Lucius, Stephen was chosen to fill it.^t Stephen, a man of violent and arrogant character, speedily embroiled himself with some Asiatic bishops on a question as to the manner of admitting converts from heresy and schism into the Church. The question was one which had not practically occurred in the apostolic age;^u and having consequently been left open by Scripture, it had been variously determined by different churches. At Rome, proselytes were admitted by imposition of hands; in Asia, rebaptism had been practised; and for each method apostolical authority was pretended—in other words, each could plead immemorial local usage.^x Synods held at Iconium and at Synnada, apparently in the reign of Alexander Severus, had established the rule of rebaptism throughout most churches of Asia Minor.^y In Africa the same practice had been sanctioned by a synod held under Agrippinus, bishop of Carthage, about the beginning of the century;^z but—chiefly perhaps because conversions from sectarianism were rare—it seems to have fallen into disuse in the interval between Agrippinus and Cyprian.^a

The origin of the disagreement between Stephen and the Asiatics is unknown; it may possibly have been that some Orientals, residing at Rome, wished to introduce there the practice of their native

^r Pontius, 9–10.

^s Cyprian, in writing both to Lucius (Ep. lxi. 3) and to Stephen (lxviii. 5) styles Cornelius a martyr; but it would seem that the word is not meant to signify a violent death, although the Eusebian Chronicle (ap. Hieron. t. viii. 650), St. Jerome (De VV. Illust. 66; Vita S. Pauli, 2), and other later writers, state that Cornelius was slain. See Tillem. iii. 468; Migne, iii. 681.

^t Euseb. vii. 2.

^u Augustin. de Baptismo cont. Donatistas, iv. 9.

^x Tillem. iv. 140; Mosh. 543–4; Walch, ii. 315.

^y Dion. Alex. ap. Euseb. vii. 7.

^z Cypr. Ep. 70. Tertullian disallows the baptism of heretics. (De Bapt. 15; De Pudic. 19.) See note by Dom Thomas, in Migne, ii. 1183; Münter, 151.

^a Aug. de Bapt. iii. 16; Mosh. 536–7; Tillem. iv. 143. On the whole question, see a learned note by Fell in Cyp. p. 243; reprinted by Routh, Reliq. Sac. iii. 210–6; and by Migne, Patrol. iii. 1073–7.

Churches.^b Neither is it exactly known what Stephen's own opinion was; whether his words—that converts “from *whatsoever* heresy”^c should be received by imposition of hands—are to be understood absolutely, or with limitations agreeable to the Church's later judgment.^d It seems, however, to be certain that he was engaged in controversy with the Asiatics before the difference with Cyprian arose. He wrote to them on the subject of their practice, and they refused to abandon it.^e

Cyprian was drawn into the controversy by a question of some Numidian and Mauritanian bishops, who had probably been led to suspect the propriety of rebaptism by seeing that the Novatianists used it in the case of proselytes from the Church.^f He replied that converts must be baptised, unless they had received the regular baptism of the Church before falling into heresy or schism, in which case imposition of hands would suffice.^g He argued that there could be only one Church, one faith, one baptism; that, as at baptism itself there is required a profession of belief in “life everlasting, and the forgiveness of sins through the Holy Church,”^h there can be no forgiveness without the Church; that the water cannot be sanctified unto cleansing by one who is himself unclean;ⁱ and—since the claim of prescription could not be advanced for this view in Africa, as it was in the East—he maintained that reason ought to prevail over custom.^k The principle was affirmed by three Carthaginian councils, the last of which was held in September, 256; but, although they disclaimed all intention of laying down a rule for other churches, Stephen refused to see the envoys who had been sent to him after the second council,^l charged his flock to withhold all hospitality from them, denounced Cyprian in outrageous language,^m and broke off communion with the Africans,ⁿ as he had before done with the Asiatics.

^b Mosh. 538.

^c Cyp. Ep. lxxiv. 1.

^d See Pearson, 54; Nat. Alex. vi. Dissert. 13-4; Pagi, iii. 64; Thomassin, in Patrolog. iii. 1250, seqq.; Walch, ii. 334-345; Rettberg, 160-5, &c.

^e Dion. Alex. ap. Euseb. vii. 5. See Maran, Vit. S. Cypr. c. 29; Mosh. 540; Schröckh, iv. 324; Neander, i. 441.

^f See Cyp. Ep. lxxiii. 2.

^g Ep. 71.

^h “Credis in vitam æternam et remissionem peccatorum per sanctam ecclesiam?” Conc. Carth. de Bapt. I. (Ep. lxx. 2.)

ⁱ Ibid.

^k “Non est autem de consuetudine

præscribendum, sed ratione vincendum.” Ep. lxxi. 2.

^l That this mission was after the second Council—not, as some suppose, after the third—see Walch, ii. 361.

^m Firmil. ad Cypr. last section:—“Non pudet Stephanum . . . Cyprianum pseudochristum et pseudapostolum et dolosum operarium dicere.”

ⁿ This appears to be certain, although some Romanists, unwilling to allow that a pope can have taken such a step against so eminent a saint as Cyprian, argue that Stephen went no further than threatening. See Baron. 258. 50; Pagi, iii. 64; Tillem. iv. 156; Mosh. 538, 543; Walch, ii. 363; Rettb. 172, 184-6.

Such a proceeding, however, on the part of a bishop of Rome in the third century, did not, like the excommunications of popes in later times, imply a claim of authority to separate from the body of Christ, or to deprive of the means of grace; it was merely an exercise of the power which every bishop had to suspend religious intercourse with communities or persons whom he supposed to be in error.^o

Finding himself thus cut off from communion with the great church of the West, Cyprian resolved to open a correspondence with the Asiatics who were in the same condition.^p He therefore sent a letter, with a report of his proceedings, to Firmilian, bishop of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia (who has already been mentioned as a friend of Origen). Firmilian's answer deals very freely with Stephen's character and conduct—so much so, that the first editors to whom it became known suppressed it on account of its bearing against the later pretensions of Rome, and that other Romanists have since justified the suppression, and have regretted that such a document had been allowed to see the light.^q

The sequel is not distinctly recorded. The death of Stephen, early in the year 257,^r contributed towards a peaceful settlement of the dispute. Dionysius of Alexandria, whose own opinions probably inclined to the Roman view,^s exerted himself as a mediator by writing both to Stephen and to his successor, Xystus or Sixtus;^t and from the mention of Xystus, by Cyprian's contemporary biographer, as a "good and *peacemaking* priest,"^u it is inferred that the controversy was laid to rest for the time by an understanding that every church should be left to its own judgment. The question of rebaptism was afterwards decided against Cyprian's views (or rather, perhaps, by a middle course between them and those of

Stephen) in the eighth canon of the Council of Arles, A.D. 314. which ordered that, if the schismatical baptism had been administered in the name of the Trinity, converts should be admitted to the Church by imposition of hands.^x

^o Mosh. 447, 538. Compare the reasoning of Tillemont as to something which took place at the Council of Ephesus, xiv. 412.

^p Mosh. 543-4.

^q See Baluze's note at the beginning of the Epistle (Patrol. iii. 1153); Pearson's Minor Works, ed. Churton, I. civ. cviii. Some Romanists (Missori, Molkenbuhr, &c.) have endeavoured to deny its genuineness, on account of its hostility to Roman pretensions, but Mr. Shepherd supposes it to be a forgery in

the papal interest! See Gieseler I. i. 396, and the Quarterly Review, xciii. 103.

^r Pearson, 60.

^s Neander thinks the contrary, i. 443. Comp. Walch, ii. 372-3.

^t Euseb. vii. 5; Tillem. iv. 142-3, 160; Rettb. 193-4.

^u Pontius, c. 14; comp. Gieseler, I. i. 397; Tillem. iv. 160-1.

^x Hard. i. 265. St. Jerome says that the bishops who had taken part with Cyprian, afterwards passed a decree to

When the persecution under Valerian reached Africa, Cyprian was carried before the proconsul, Paternus.^y He avowed A.D. 257.
Aug. 30. himself a Christian and a bishop; he added that Christians served one only God, and that they prayed daily for themselves, for all mankind, and for the safety of the emperors. On being questioned as to the names of his clergy, he said that the laws of the state condemned informers; that ecclesiastical discipline forbade the clergy to offer themselves for punishment; but that, if sought for, they might be found in their places. As he steadfastly refused to sacrifice, he was banished to Curubis, about forty miles from Carthage, which Pontius, who accompanied him, describes as a pleasant abode.^z On the night after his arrival there, a vision announced to him that he was to be put to death next day; the event proved that the delay of a day was to be interpreted as signifying a year. His residence at Curubis was cheered by frequent visits from his friends. The means which were at his disposal enabled him to send relief to many of his brethren who had been carried away to labour in the mines of Mauritania and Numidia, and were treated with great barbarity; and he exchanged with these, and other confessors, letters of sympathy and encouragement.^a

the contrary (adv. Lucif. 23); but there is no other authority for the statement. At a later time, rebaptism of proselytes was practised by the Donatists, who naturally insisted much on the authority of St. Cyprian. St. Augustine, in his treatise 'De Baptismo contra Donatistas,' tells them that, if Cyprian's view as to baptism was in their favour, his doctrine of ecclesiastical unity, and the charity which made him willing to allow a difference of practice without breach of communion, were strongly in condemnation of them. (i. 28; ii. 12; v. i. See too *Contra Crescon.* ii. 39, seqq., and *De Unico Baptismo.*) He argues at great length against the arguments of Cyprian and his councils: "Christi baptisma," he says, "ubique sanctum est, et quamvis apud hæreticos vel schismaticos, ipsius tamen hæresis vel schismatis non est, et ideo nec ad ipsam Catholicam inde venientes oportet denuo baptizari" (i. 29). For his views as to the effect of schismatical baptism, see iii. 18. He often speaks of a "plenary" council as having pronounced against Cyprian's views; it seems most likely that the Council of Arles is meant, although some suppose the allusion to be to the Council of Nicæa, inasmuch as the same principle which admits the

baptism of schismatics was involved in the recognition of Novatianist orders by the 8th Nicene Canon. See note on the treatise, ii. 14; *Nat. Alex.* vi. Dissert. 24; *Hieron. adv. Lucif.* 27; *Tillem.* iv. 160, 632; *Dupin*, i. 152; *Pagi*, iii. 574-7; *Rettberg*, 194.

^y The remaining part of the story is from Pontius and the proconsular Acts. (*Patrol.* iii.-iv.)

^z Gibbon—whose zeal in extenuating the conduct of persecutors towards the Christians would be amusing, if it were not very disgusting—dwells much on the pleasantness of Curubis, and other such points (i. 558-60). *M. Guizot* well remarks—"Setting aside all religious considerations, it is impossible not to be surprised at the kind of complaisance with which the historian here insists, in favour of the persecutors, on some mitigating circumstances allowed at the death of a man whose only crime was maintaining his own opinions with frankness and courage" (note, ib. p. 560; see too *Mackintosh*, ib. 527). Moreover, it is very clear, even from the narrative of Pontius, that the case of Cyprian was not what Gibbon professes to consider it—an average specimen of the treatment of the victims.

^a *Epp.* 77, seqq.

On the arrival of a new proconsul, Galerius, Cyprian was recalled from banishment, and was ordered to remain at his gardens near Carthage. Valerian's second and more severe edict^b had now been issued, and the bishop was resolved to endure for his faith the worst that man could inflict on him. Fearing, however, during a temporary absence of the proconsul at Utica, lest he should be carried to that city, instead of being sacrificed in the sight of his own people, he concealed himself for a time; but, on the return of Galerius to Carthage, he reappeared at his gardens, and withstood all the entreaties of his friends who urged him to save himself by flight. On the 13th of September, 258, he was carried to a place where the proconsul was staying for the recovery of his health, about four miles from Carthage. Here the bishop was treated with great respect, and was allowed to enjoy the society of his friends at supper, while the streets around the proconsul's house, in which he lodged, were thronged by Christians anxious for their pastor's safety. These had flocked from the capital on the news of his arrest; many of them spent the night in the open air, and a vast multitude crowded the place of judgment, where on the following day—the anniversary of the martyrdom of Cornelius—Cyprian was led forth for trial. As he arrived, heated with the walk from the proconsul's house, a soldier of the guard, who had formerly been a Christian, offered him some change of dress; but he declined the offer, saying that it was useless to remedy evils which would probably forthwith come to an end. The proconsul took his seat, and required him to sacrifice; Cyprian answered by a refusal. The magistrate desired him to consider his safety. "Do as thou art commanded," was the reply; "in so righteous a cause there is no room for consideration." It was with reluctance and difficulty that Galerius, after a short consultation with his advisers, pronounced the inevitable sentence,—That Thascius Cyprian, as having long been a ringleader in impiety against the gods of Rome, and having resisted the attempts made by the emperors to reclaim him, should be beheaded with the sword, in punishment of his offences, and as a warning to his followers. The bishop received his doom with an expression of thankfulness to God; and a cry arose from the Christians who were present, "Let us go and be beheaded with him!" Cyprian was without delay conducted to the scene of execution—a level space surrounded by thick trees, the branches of which were soon filled by members of his flock, who eagerly climbed up "like Zacchæus,"

^b See p. 98.

that they might witness their bishop's triumph over death. After having knelt for a short time in prayer, he bound his eyes with his own hands, and, having directed that a present should be given to the executioner, submitted to the sword. His body was deposited in a neighbouring spot, "because of the curiosity of the heathen," but was afterwards removed by torchlight with great solemnity, and laid in an honourable sepulture; while his blood, which had been carefully caught in cloths and handkerchiefs as it fell, was treasured up as a precious relic.

It is said that Cyprian daily read some portion of Tertullian's works, and that he was accustomed to ask for the book by saying to his secretary, "Give me my master."^c The influence of his great countryman on his mind is abundantly evident in his writings;^d perhaps Tertullian's Montanism may have shared, as well as the African temperament,^e in producing his tendency to a belief in frequent supernatural visitations. But if Cyprian was inferior to the earlier writer in originality and genius, he was free from his exaggeration and irregularity, and possessed talents for practical life of which Tertullian gives no indication. The master was carried into schism; the scholar's great and ruling idea was that of unity in the visible Church, and it was on this that his controversies turned. In his treatise on the subject he ransacks Scripture for types and arguments; he concludes that "he who has not the Church for his mother, cannot have God for his Father;"^f that the Church is as the ark of Noah, without which there was no deliverance from destruction;^g that for those who are separate from the visible Church neither miracles nor martyrdom can avail as evidences of faith or as grounds of hope.^h While we may agree in his principles generally, it can hardly be doubted that he carries them out with a reasoning too precise for the nature of the subject; that he does not sufficiently consider the share which the character and circumstances of each individual, as well as his outward position or profession, have in determining his state before God; or the indications afforded by Scripture, that, besides the main broad system of the Divine government, there is also with the Almighty a merciful regard to exceptions and peculiarities,—a regard of which man indeed may not presume to forestall the effect, but

^c Hieron. de Viris Illustr. c. 53.

^d Rettb. 17, 19, 30, 36, 218, 221; Neander, ii. 446. For Cyprian's obligations to Minucius Felix, see Le Nourry, in Migne's Patrologia, iii. 405-8.

^e Neander, i. 329.

^f De Unitate Eccles. 6.

^g Ib.

^h Ib. 15, 19. Here, it will be observed, Cyprian opposed the tendency of his age to overvalue martyrdom.

which we are yet bound reverently, charitably, and thankfully to keep in mind.^f

It would, however, be an utter misunderstanding of Cyprian to suppose that in his views of unity he was influenced either by want of charity towards those whose schism he condemned, or by a wish to secure for himself, as bishop, a tyrannical domination over the minds of men. It was the tendency of the age to elevate the episcopate, as a power conducive to strength, to union, regularity, and peace; but if Cyprian bore a part in promoting the exaltation of his order, it was the natural effect of his great character, not the object or the result of his ambition.^k Now that Christianity had long been professed by multitudes as a religion derived by inheritance, not embraced from special conviction—now that time and freedom from persecution had produced a general deterioration in the community, so that the bishop could not reckon on unanimous support in his measures for the regulation of the Church—it was necessary for the public good that he should sometimes act by his own authority in a greater degree than the bishops of earlier times. Yet Cyprian was far from any attempt at establishing an autocracy; it was his practice, as well as his desire, to take no important step except in conjunction with his clergy and his people.^l

On the other hand, the unity which Cyprian contemplated was utterly unlike that of later Rome.^m In his dealings with the Roman bishops he appears on terms of perfect equality with them. He writes to them and of them as merely his “brethren and col-

^f “By accommodation I mean the principle observable in God’s merciful dispensations, of suiting Himself to the infirmities and errors of His creatures, by occasional variations of His own stated laws, without any repeal of those laws themselves. To begin from the highest ground:—It is evident that all mercy is an accommodation of this kind; a suspension in particular cases of the execution of the laws of rigorous justice; those laws still preserving their supreme authority, and being virtually acknowledged in the very gratitude which hails their apparent supersession. . . .

“With this striking example [of the Fall and the Redemption] impressed on your minds, and separating (as you may easily do) the principle involved in it from its details, consider first,—Is it unlikely that God should appoint a special organization of the means of grace in His Church? Secondly, *that, when that organization has been more or less im-*

paired, He should condescend to continue His gifts in a manner accommodated to the alteration?

“Nay, it is supposable that the whole body of [irregular religious] systems, though human and unauthorised, may be found to form *designed members* in a vast scheme of divine moral government, of which the Church itself is as yet but a part, though the noblest part.”—Archer Butler, *Sermons*. Dublin, 1849, pp. 470, 472–3, 480–1.

^k Schröckh, iv. 278; Neander, i. 268.

^l Epp. 28, 38, &c. See Möhler, ‘Einheit in der Kirche,’ 198–202, ed. 2.

^m See Field on the Church, b. v. c. 36; Ellendorf, ‘Der Primat der röm. Päpste,’ i. In remarkable opposition to the German writers who suppose that Cyprian laboured to set up a new and higher idea of the episcopate, Dr. Pusey argues that he condescended from an idea which he had inherited. Councils of the Church, c. iii. Oxford, 1857.

leagues." Far from acknowledging a superiority in them, he remonstrates with Cornelius for lowering the common dignity of the episcopate.ⁿ He admonishes Stephen when negligent of his duty in one case; he declares his judgment null, and sets it aside, in another;^o he treats the idea of a "bishop of bishops" as monstrous^p—far as Stephen's understanding of such a title fell short of the more recent Roman pretensions. Even supposing all the passages in which he magnifies the Roman Church to be genuine—(and where words of this sort are wanting in some manuscripts there is an almost certain presumption against them, inasmuch as in the times to which the manuscripts belong there was no temptation to omit, but a strong inducement to insert such words^q)—still the dignity which he assigns to that Church, to its supposed Apostolic founder, and his successors, is only that of precedence among equals; it is rather purely symbolical than in any way practical. He regards St. Peter as the type of apostleship, and the Roman Church as the representative of unity; he interprets the promise of "the keys of the kingdom of heaven" as given to the apostle for the whole episcopal order;^r his language and his actions are alike inconsistent with any idea of subjection to Rome as a higher authority entitled to interfere with other Churches or to overrule their determinations.

ⁿ Ep. lix. 2.

^o Epp. 67–8, as to the affair of Marician bishop of Arles, and that of the Spanish bishops Basilides and Martial. See Field, iii. 348, 355–8, ed. Lond. 1850; Quart. Rev. xciii. 105–8.

^p "Neque enim quisquam nostrum episcopum se episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem collegas suos adigit, quando habeat omnis episcopus pro licentia libertatis et potestatis suæ arbitrium proprium, tamque judicari ab alio non possit quam nec ipse potest alterum judicare. Sed expectemus universi iudicium Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui unus et solus habet potestatem et præponendi nos in ecclesiæ suæ gubernatione, et de actu nostro judicandi." Cyp. ad Conc. Carth. de Baptismo III. (Migne, iii. 1054).

^q "Some of these are almost certainly interpolated; one, and perhaps the most celebrated, in the treatise *De Unitate Ecclesiæ* (c. 4), has words which are wanting in most MSS. Baluze followed Bishop Fell in rejecting them, and so the passage was printed before his death, which took place while his edition was in the press; but the Benedictines, on whom the completion of the work devolved, cancelled the leaf, and, while they preserved in the notes Baluze's reasons for rejecting the words, restored them in the text for the sake of uniformity with other French editions (propterea quod servata fuerunt in omnibus editionibus quæ in Gallia ab annis cl. prodierunt)." Quart. Rev. xciii. 114. See too Ellendorf, i. 182.

^r Ep. 33.

CHAPTER VII.

FROM THE ACCESSION OF GALLIENUS TO THE EDICT OF
TOLERATION BY CONSTANTINE.

A.D. 261-313.

GALLIENUS, when left sole emperor by the captivity of his father A.D. 261- and colleague, put a stop to the persecution which 268. Valerian had commenced, and issued edicts by which the exiles were recalled, the cemeteries were restored to the Christians, and a free exercise of religion was granted.^a Thus was Christianity for the first time acknowledged as a lawful religion; a benefit which, in so far as the frivolous and worthless prince was concerned, it probably owed to his indifference rather than to any better motive.

In this reign began a contest as to the see of Antioch, which lasted for several years. Paul, a native of Samosata, had been appointed bishop about A.D. 260. He enjoyed the protection of Zenobia, queen of Palmyra, and was generally admired for his eloquence; but both his opinions and his manners gave scandal to many of the neighbouring clergy, and to the more discerning portion of his flock. Through the favour of Zenobia, as is supposed, he obtained a considerable civil office;^b and he chose to be addressed by the title of Ducenary rather than by that of Bishop. In his public appearances Paul affected the state and pomp of a Roman magistrate; he even introduced much of this display into his ecclesiastical functions. He erected a *tribunal* and railed off a *secretum* in his church; in preaching he used the gestures of secular orators, while he expected the hearers to receive his words with clapping of hands and waving of handkerchiefs, as if in a theatre; he discarded the old grave music of the Church, and introduced female singers into his choir; nay, it is said that he substituted hymns in celebration of himself for those which had been sung in honour of the Saviour, and that he

^a Euseb. vii. 13.^b *Ducenarius*—an officer employed in the collection of the revenue, and socalled from his salary of 200 sesterces —about 1600*l.* Gibbon, i. 573; Giese-ler, I. i. 300.

caused himself to be extolled by the preachers of his party as an angel from heaven. He is charged with having enriched himself by taking bribes, not only in the character of ducenary, but in his episcopal capacity of arbiter between the brethren. And he is further accused of luxurious living, and of indecent familiarity with young women—two of whom were his constant companions.^c

It has been supposed that Paul's system of doctrine was framed with a view to the favour of his patroness, who is said by St. Athanasius to have been attached to Judaism.^d His adversaries describe it as akin to that of Artemon.^e He maintained that there is no distinction of Persons in the Godhead; that the Logos and the Holy Ghost are *in* the Father in the same manner as the reason and the spirit are in man; that, when the Logos is said to have been from everlasting, nothing more than an ideal existence in the Divine foreknowledge is meant; that His "generation" means only a going forth to act; that Jesus was a mere man (although it was *perhaps* admitted that his birth was supernatural); that he is called Son of God, as having in a certain sense *become* such through the influence of the Divine Logos, which dwelt in him, but without any personal union.^f

A synod of bishops and clergy from Syria, Asia, and Arabia, assembled in 264, to consider the case of Paul. Among the members were Firmilian, Gregory of Neocæsarea, and his brother Athenodore; and the venerable Dionysius of Alexandria, although compelled by age and infirmity to excuse himself from attendance, addressed to the assembly a letter in strong condemnation of Paul's opinions.^g The accused, however, succeeded in throwing a veil over his unsoundness; he satisfied his brethren by expressing himself in plausible terms, and by promising to abstain from everything that could give offence.^h The promise was not kept. Two

^c These statements are taken from the letter of the council which deposed him (Euseb. vii. 30). As he objected to the Christian hymns on account of their having been lately composed, it has been inferred that he substituted the Old Testament Psalms (Mosh. 703; Neander, ii. 330-1). Mosheim sees in this a wish to please his patroness, but Neander thinks otherwise. The statement that Paul caused hymns to be sung in his own honour might almost seem incredible; yet, as Dr. Routh points out, St. Jerome's evidence (In Matth. xxi. 15) that it was usual to welcome bishops with shouts of Hosanna may serve to lessen the improbability (Reliq. Sac. iii. 340; comp. Bingham, II. ix. 3). The sermons

in praise of Paul were no doubt controversial, and preached after the beginning of the contest (Mosh. 704). As to the last charge, Heinichen (Excursus 13 in Euseb.) strongly argues that, while the bishop's association with his female companions was imprudent, there is no reason to suppose that there was anything worse in it.

^d Hist. Arian. ad Monachos, 71; Theodoret, Hær. ii. 8; Mosh. 706.

^e Euseb. vii. 30; Theod. ii. 8.

^f Epiphanius, lxxv. 1-2; Mosh. 702, 712-3; Gieseler, I. i. 301.

^g Euseb. vii. 27. Dionysius died soon after this. Ibid. 28.

^h Euseb. vii. 28.

more councils were held;¹ and at the second of these the subtleties which had imposed on less expert theologians were detected by a presbyter named Malchion, who, having formerly been a distinguished sophist or rhetorician, was skilled in the intricacies of such disputation.^k The bishop was deposed, and Domnus, son of his predecessor, was appointed to succeed him.

Paul still persisted in keeping his position. Relying on the protection of Zenobia, and probably supported by a large party among the Christians of Antioch, he retained the episcopal house, with the church which adjoined it;¹ and the dispute as to the possession of these was referred to the emperor Aurelian, soon after his victory over Zenobia. Aurelian wisely abstained from intermeddling in a question of Christian doctrines and usages. He decided that the buildings should belong to that party which the bishops of Rome and of Italy should acknowledge as being in communion with themselves; and their judgment, pronounced in favour of Domnus, was enforced by the civil power.^m

Aurelian's impartial decision of this case was not, however, prompted by any favourable disposition towards the Gospel. The emperor was deeply devoted to the Pagan system, and most especially to the worship of the Sun, of which his mother had been a priestess.ⁿ He regarded the Christians with contempt;^o and, notwithstanding the restraints imposed on him by the measures of Gallienus, he had issued an

¹ Tillem. iv. 296-7; Clinton, A.D. 265. Baronius and Pagi (iii. 178-9) allow only one council after the first.

^k Euseb. vii. 29; Hieron. de Viris Illustr. 71. This council is generally supposed (although the fact has been questioned by Dr. Burton and others) to have condemned the term *ὁμοούσιος* (*consubstantial* or *co-essential*)—whether it were that Paul used it in a sense different from that in which the Nicene Council afterwards adopted it, or that he made it the foundation for heterodox inferences. See Athan. de Synodis, 43-7, and Newman's notes in Oxf. Trans. pp. 147, 165-176; Bull, v. 92-98; Tillem. iv. 300-1; Routh, Rel. Sac. iii. 362-5; Burton, ii. 399; Newman on Arianism, 31, 209.

¹ It seems most probable that *both* are included in the words *τοῦ τῆς ἐκκλησίας οἴκου* (Euseb. vii. 30; Tillem. iv. 302; Mosh. 713). Mosheim (716) and Gibbon (i. 574) suppose that the people took

part with Paul because their right of election had been set aside in the appointment of Domnus to the see by authority of the Council alone. But if the usual practice was violated in this case, surely the attachment of the people to the heretical bishop was more likely a cause than a consequence of the Council's proceeding. Comp. Bingham, IV. ii. 12.

^m Euseb. vii. 30; Mosh. 717-8; Burton, ii. 405; Neander, i. 196. The remarks of some Romanists—which may be exemplified by the Abbé Rohrbacher's mention of the affair in his Table of Contents (vol. v.)—"Primaute du Siège de Rome reconnue par Aurélien"—are palpably absurd. The eastern bishops, having been parties in the case, were disqualified for acting as umpires. Aurelian, therefore, referred it to another portion of the Church—naturally naming as first the bishop of his own imperial city.

ⁿ Vopiscus, 4; Gibbon, i. 324.

^o Vopisc. 20; Mosh. 559.

order for a persecution, in token of gratitude to the gods for his success in war, when, before the document could be generally circulated, he was assassinated in his camp.^p

It appears to have been during the reign of Aurelian, and probably about the year 270, that Manes began to publish his opinions in Persia.^q As to the history of this earlier Mahomet, the Greek and the Oriental accounts differ widely from each other. The Greeks^r trace the heresy to a Saracen merchant named Scythian, who, after having become rich by trading to India, settled at Alexandria, and devised a philosophical system of his own.^s At his death, which took place in Palestine,^t his manuscripts,^u with the rest of his property, fell to his servant Terebinth, who, in order to obtain a more favourable field for the propagation of his doctrines, went into Persia, where he assumed the name of Buddas.^x He was, however, beaten in disputation by the priests of the national religion; and, one day, while engaged in incantations on the roof of his house, he was thrown headlong and killed by an angel or a demon.^y A widow with whom he had lodged, and who had been his only convert, buried the body and took possession of his wealth; she bought a boy seven years old, named Cubricus, or Corbicius, liberated him,

^p Euseb. vii. 30; Lactantius (?) *De Mortibus Persecutorum*, 6; Pagi, iii. 186-8; Mosh. 358-360; Gibbon, i. 572-3, with Guizot's note.

^q See Gibbon, ii. 185; Clinton, A.D. 261, 272. Manes was probably born about 240. Beausobre, i. 122; Burton, ii. 408.

^r The chief source of this account is the report of the disputation between Archelaus and Manes, which may be found in Routh's *Reliquiæ*, vol. v. The genuineness of the book is much questioned, and seemingly with reason, as by Beausobre (*Hist. de Manichéisme et du Manichéisme*, i. 108-112, 129-154); Mosheim, 729; Burton, ii. 410; Neander, ii. 165; Milman, ii. 328. Beausobre (i. 153) and Mosheim (l. c.) date the composition about 330.

^s The Disputation (51) and Epiphanius (lxvi. 2) place Scythian in the apostolic age, which is clearly inconsistent with the other dates of the story.

^t Disput. 52. Epiphanius (c. 3), unsupported by earlier authority, says that he was thrown from a housetop by demons—the same death which is ascribed to Terebinth—and that Terebinth, instead of returning to his master's

widow (who is said by Epiphanius to have resembled the first heresiarch's Helena in character, while the author of the Disputation is content to describe her as a captive), ran off with Scythian's money and MSS. into Persia. See Beausob. i. 50-2. Baur disbelieves the existence of Scythian. Manich. Religions-System, 462.

^u Some ascribe the authorship of these MSS., which consisted of four books, to Scythian, others to Terebinth (Beausob. i. 46). The words of the Disputation—"qui [Terebinthus] scripsit ei [Scythiano] quatuor libros"—seem to mean that they were written by Terebinth at his master's dictation.

^x Disput. 52; Cyrill. Hierosol. Catech. vi. 23. Beausobre (i. 54) says that this was merely a translation of his Greek name—*Bontam* or *Bontema* being Chaldean for the *terebinth*-tree. So too Lassen, *Indische Alterthumskunde*, iii. 407.

^y Disput. 52; Cyrill. Hierosol. vi. 23. See Beausobre for the various accounts, i. 59. Professor Lassen thinks that Scythian is an imaginary person, and that Terebinth was the real originator of Manichæism. iii. 406-7.

bestowed on him a learned education, and, dying when he had reached the age of twelve, left him heir to all that she possessed. Cubricus assumed the name of Manes,^z and, after an interval of nearly half a century,^a as to which no details are given, appeared at the Persian court, carrying with him the books of Scythian, which he had interpolated with "anile fables," and claimed as his own productions. He undertook to cure a son of king Sapor of a dangerous sickness, and, having failed, was cast into prison.^b While he was in confinement, two of his disciples, whom he had sent out on missions, returned, and reported that they had found Christians the most impracticable of all with whom they had argued. On this Manes procured the Christian Scriptures,^c and adopted much from them into his system, styling himself *The Apostle of Christ*, and *The Paraclete*.^d He escaped from prison, and opened a communication with Marcellus, an eminent and pious Christian of Cascara, whose influence he was anxious to secure for the recommendation of his doctrine.^e The bishop of the place, Archelaus, however, won over his envoy, Tyrbo, and from him and others discovered the doctrines of the sect, with the history of its origin.^f He vanquished the heresiarch in A.D. 277. conferences at Cascara and Diodoris; and Manes soon after again fell into the hands of the Persian king, by whose order he was flayed alive.^g

According to the Oriental statements, on the other hand, Mani was a Persian, of the Magian or sacerdotal caste, and possessed

^z In allusion (it is said) to his eloquence—the word signifying in Persian *speech or discourse* (Cyrill. vi. 24). Epiphanius says that the word meant in Babylonian a *vessel or instrument* (*συσδος*), but that he was providentially led to choose a name which in Greek signified *madness*. (lxvi. 6; cf. Cyril, l. c.; Titus, Bishop of Bostra [about A.D. 360], in Canisius, i. 60.) "Soit pour éviter cette fâcheuse allusion," says Tillemont, "soit simplement pour donner à son nom une terminaison Grecque, ses sectateurs l'appelaient *Manichée*, et ils prétendaient signifier par ce nom qu'il répandait la *manne* d'une doctrine céleste" (iv. 383. Cf. Aug. de Hæres. 46, init.; c. Faust. xix. 21). Another interpretation of the name represents it as meaning *comforter*. (See Beausobre, i. 65–74.) Professor Lassen says that it unquestionably comes from the old Persian *manich*, i. e. *spirit*. iii. 405.

^a "Effectus igitur puer ille annorum prope sexaginta" (Disput. 53). The

Vatican MS. reads "septuaginta."

^b Disp. 53. Mosheim suggests that this part of the story may have arisen from misunderstanding of a Persian allegory;—that the prince's disease was *ignorance*,—that Mani was employed as his *tutor*, and that by the pupil's death is meant his *perversion from the religion of Zoroaster*! Thus Mosheim would account for the favour shown to the heresiarch by Hormisdas, whom he supposes to have been the prince in question (739–740).

^c In order to obtain a copy, his disciples had to pretend that they were Christians. Disp. 54.

^d Disp. 13, 54; Cyrill. vi. 25. St. Augustine speaks of these titles as equivalent (De Hæres. 46, t. viii. 38; c. Epist. Fundamenti, 7).

^e Disp. 1–5. It is disputed whether the name of the place means Cashgar or Carrhæ. See Beausob. i. 137, seqq., 191; Routh, Rel. Sac. v. 19, 20, 25.

^f Disp. 6.

^g Disp. 55.

an extraordinary variety of accomplishments.^h He embraced Christianity, and is said by one authorityⁱ to have been a presbyter in the Church before he formed his peculiar scheme of doctrine. Having been imprisoned by Sapor, on account of his opinions, he escaped, travelled in India and China, and at length retired into a cave in Turkestan, telling his disciples that he was about to ascend into heaven, and that at the end of a year he would meet them again at a certain place.^k The interval was employed in elaborating his system, and, on his reappearance, he produced the book of a new revelation, adorned with symbolical pictures by his own hand.^l After the death of Sapor he returned to the Persian court, where he was well received by ^{A.D. 272.} Hormisdas, and made a convert of him; but within less than two years he lost his royal patron. The next king, Varanes, at first treated him with favour, but was soon gained ^{A.D. 277.} over by his enemies; he invited him to dispute with the Magians, and, on their declaring Mani a heretic, caused him to be put to death,—whether by flaying, crucifixion, or sawing asunder, is uncertain.^m

Although Manichæism in many points resembled some of the Gnostic systems, the likeness did not arise from any direct connexion, but from the Persian element which it had in common with Gnosticism.ⁿ Manes was not influenced either by Jewish traditions or by Greek philosophy; but, in addition to the Zoroastrian and the Christian sources, it has been supposed that, in the completion of his scheme, he drew largely from the doctrines of Buddhism,^o with which (if the account of his eastern travels be rejected) it appears that he might have become acquainted in his native country.^p

^h Beausob. i. 157. Professor Lassen says that the Oriental accounts are of the Mahometan time, and are untrustworthy. iii. 407.

ⁱ See Mosh. 737.

^k Beausob. i. 187. Professor Lassen disbelieves the story of his travels.

^l Beausob. i. 190.

^m Beausob. i. 205; Mosh. 733-740; Neander, ii. 167-170; Baur, 431. Dean Milman endeavours to harmonise the eastern and western stories. ii. 327.

ⁿ Tillem. iv. 368; Schröckh, iv. 418; Neander, ii. 157-8. Yet if there be any truth in the derivation of the system from Scythian or Alexandria, a connexion with Gnosticism is traced. Matter, iii. 73.

^o See Baur, 434, seqq.; Neander, ii. 159, seqq.; Milman, ii. 322-5;

Pusey, in Transl. of St. Augustine's Confessions (Oxf. 1838), 314-5; Matter, iii. 77. The *Buddas* of the Greek story is supposed to have originated in a misunderstanding of some legend as to Buddha, and this conjecture is favoured by the statement that he pretended to have been, like Buddha (Hieron. adv. Jovinian. i. 42; Baur, 441), born of a virgin. (Disp. 52; Neander, ii. 160; Milman, ii. 325.) On the other hand, Gieseler (I. i. 304-5) refers to Schneckenburger as having disproved Baur's theory. Beausobre (i. 57) supposes that Terebinth did not pretend to have been born of a virgin, but that the story of the eastern Buddha was wrongly transferred to him. See Baur, 463.

^p See Lassen, iii. 408-415.

The deliverance of Persia from the Parthian yoke by Artaxerxes had been followed by a reformation of the national religion.^q The belief in one Supreme Being, anterior to the opposite powers of Light and Darkness, or Good and Evil, had been established, and a persecution had been carried on against those who maintained the original and independent existence of Ormuzd and Ahriman.^r This pure dualism, however, was taken up by Manes. He held that there were two principles, eternally opposed to each other, and presiding respectively over the realms of light and darkness. To the former the name of God properly belonged; the latter, although the Manichees admitted that in some sense he too might be styled God (as St. Paul speaks of "the God of this world"^s), was more rightly named *Demon* or *Matter* (ἕλν). These powers were independent of each other; but God was the superior.^t God consisted of pure light, infinitely more subtle than that of our world, and without any definite bodily shape; ^u the Demon had a gross material body.^x Each realm was composed of five elements, which were peopled by beings of kindred natures; and, while the inhabitants of the world of light lived in perfect love and harmony, those of the world of darkness were continually at strife among themselves.^y In one of their wars the defeated party fled to the lofty mountains which bounded the two worlds; thence they desecrated the realm of light, whose existence had before been unknown to them; and forthwith all the powers of darkness, laying aside their internal discords, united to invade the newly-discovered region.^z God then produced from himself a being called *Mother of Life*, and from her one named *Primal Man*, whom he armed with the five good elements, and sent forth to combat against the powers of evil.^a The invaders, however, were prevailing, when, at the prayer of Primal Man, God sent forth *Living Spirit*, by whom they were driven out, and Primal Man was rescued; although not until the powers of darkness had swallowed "a portion of his armour, which is the living

^q Beausob. i. 165.

^r See Beausob. i. 175; Gibbon, c. viii.; Milman, ii. 310-4; Gieseler, I. i. 304-5.

^s 2 Cor. iv. 4; Faustus, ap. Aug. c. Faust. xxi. 1. Faustus denies that the demon was really regarded as God, but Augustine will not admit his distinction. It would seem that, by the time of Augustine, Manichæism had been developed by being carried out into minute detail, and by being rested on an elaborate misconception of Scripture.

^t Disp. 7; Tit. Bostr. p. 87; Epiphan.

lxvi. 14; Theodoret, Hær. iii. 26, p. 213,^d; Beausob. i. 175-9, 489; Mosh. 755, 765, 774; Ritter, v. 155-6.

^u Manes ap. Aug. c. Episc. Fundam. 16, 19; Beausob. i. 469; Baur, 14, 23.

^x Aug. Confess. v. 20; De Genesi adv. Manich. i. 27-8; Baur, 78.

^y Disp. 7; Aug. c. Epist. Fundam. 4. 31; Tit. Bost. pp. 68, 70-2, 87; Mosh. 759-60; Pusey, 318.

^z Tit. Bostr. pp. 72, 90; Theodoret, Hær. i. 26.

^a Disp. 7.

soul.”^b To this part, thus enchained in the bondage of matter, was given the name of *Passible Jesus*; ^c and thenceforth it was the object of the spirits of darkness to detain the heavenly particles which they had absorbed, while God was bent on effecting their deliverance.^d In order to their gradual emancipation, Living Spirit, by the command of God, framed our world out of materials in which the elements of light and darkness had become commingled during the late struggle.^e The powers of darkness produced children; their prince, by devouring these, concentrated in himself the particles of heavenly essence which were diffused through their bodies;^f and he employed the materials thus obtained in the formation of man, moulded after the image of the heavenly Primal Man. Adam was therefore a microcosm, including in himself all the elements of both kingdoms, having a soul of light and one of darkness, with a body which was material, and therefore necessarily evil.^g With a view of retaining him in bondage, his maker forbade him to eat of the tree of knowledge; but Christ or an angel, in the form of the serpent, instructed him—he ate and was enlightened.^h The Demon produced Eve, and, although God put into her a portion of heavenly light, it was not strong enough to master her evil tendencies. She tempted Adam to sensual pleasure; disregarding the commands of God, who had charged him to restrain, by means of his higher soul, the desires of his lower soul and of his body, he yielded and fell; the particles of heavenly light became yet further enthralled to matter; and, as the race of man continued, it deteriorated more and more from generation to generation.ⁱ

God had produced out of himself two beings of pure light, Christ and the Holy Spirit, whose office it was to help in the deli-

^b Ἐφαγον ἐκ τῆς πανοπλίας αὐτοῦ, ὃ ἐστὶν ἡ ψυχὴ. Disp. 7.

^c Tit. Bostr. p. 92. See Mosh. 788-9, 796, 798-9; Neander, ii. 172-6; Matter, iii. 82. Beausobre (ii. 554), Mosheim (796), and Baur (72) think that St. Augustine confounded the *Jesus patibilis* with the *Christ* of the system.

^d Tit. Bostr. p. 81.

^e Disp. 7; Mosh. 811, 823; Baur, 133. That the formation of the world was supposed to have preceded that of man, see Baur, 121, seqq.

^f So, in the Hesiodic theogony, “when Metis [*Wisdom*, the first wife of Zeus] was on the point of being delivered of Athene, he swallowed her up, and her wisdom and sagacity thus became permanently identified with his own being.”

Grote, Hist. of Greece, ed. 2, i. 13.

^g Man. ap. Aug. de Nat. Boni, 46; Disp. 7, 10, 14; Till. iv. 368; Mosh. 178-182; Matter, iii. 85-6; Baur, 138, seqq. Against the doctrine of the two souls see Aug. de Duabus Animabus. Baur differs somewhat from the usual view here, 162, seqq.

^h Aug. de Hæres. 40 (col. 37); c. Faust. i. 3; xxii. 49; Neander, ii. 183. This reversal of the parts of God and Satan in the Temptation has already come before us in Gnosticism, (p. 39). Tyrbo says that the tree of knowledge was Jesus himself. Disp. 10.

ⁱ Disp. 10; Aug. de Mor. Manich. 73; Man. ap. Aug. Op. Imperf. c. Julian. 186; Mosh. 809, 811-2; Neand. ii. 183-6, Matter, iii. 87; Baur, 152, seqq.

verance of mankind. Christ dwelt by his power in the sun, and by his wisdom in the moon—which were therefore to be worshipped, not as deities, but as *his* habitations; the Holy Spirit dwelt in the air.^k The world was supported by a mighty angel, who, from his office, was called in Greek *Omophoros* (Bearer on Shoulders); and the frequent signs of impatience exhibited by this personage (whose movements were the cause of earthquakes) hastened the coming of Christ in human form.^l As the evil nature of matter rendered it unsuitable that the Saviour should have a material body, his humanity was represented by Manes after the docetic fashion; it was supposed that he appeared suddenly among the Jews (for the narrations as to his birth and early years were rejected), and that his acts and sufferings were only in appearance.^m The object of his mission was to give enlightenment—to teach men their heavenly origin, and urge them to strive after the recovery of bliss, overcoming their body and their evil soul;ⁿ to deliver them from the blindness of Judaism and other false religions. No idea of atonement could enter into the system, since the divine soul was incapable of guilt, and the lower soul of salvation.^o

The particles of celestial life which had been absorbed by the kingdom of matter—the Passible Jesus—were not in man only, but in the lower animals,^p and in vegetables, “hanging,” it was said, “on every tree.”^q From their abodes in sun and moon and air, Christ and the Spirit act in the work of disengaging these particles; it is by *their* operation that herbs burst forth from the ground, striving towards their kindred light, while the powers of darkness, whom the Living Spirit, after his victory, had crucified in the stars, thence exert baleful influences on the earth.^r Animal and even vegetable life was therefore sacred for the Manichæans, who believed that vegetables had the same feelings of pain as man-

^k Aug. c. Faust. xx. 2; Mosh. 775, 777–780, 785; Pusey, 335.

^l Disp. 7; Epiphan. lxvi. 22. Augustine also speaks of a being with six faces, named Splenditenens, who was supposed to hold the world suspended. C. Faust. xv. 5–6. See Baur, 79.

^m Disp. 7, 47, 50; Aug. c. Faust. ii. 1; iii. 1; xxvi. 1–2.

ⁿ Fortunatus ap. Aug. Disp. 20; Baur, 243, seqq.

^o Mosh. 827–8, 830–1, 833, 840; Neand. ii. 186–7; Pusey, 322–7; Matter, iii. 88–90.

^p Minute insects, however, were excepted, as being too small to contain the heavenly particles. (Aug. de Moribus

Manich. 63–4.) It would seem that the practical inconvenience of respecting *such* lives had a share in producing this part of the creed. (Aug. c. Adimant. xii. 2.) The Buddhist Lamas are forbidden to destroy vermin—a prohibition which is generally connected with the belief in the metempsychosis, although some of the more enlightened trace it to the inconsistency of all killing with the mildness of character which becomes “men of prayer.” Huc, ‘Voyage dans la Tartarie,’ Paris, 1850, i. 236–7.

^q Aug. c. Faust. ii. 5; xxi. 2, 11; De Mor. Man. 39; De Nat. Boni, 44; Baur, 74–5.

^r Disp. 7; Aug. de Mor. Man. 36–7.

kind.^s The Elect (the highest class in the community) might not even pluck a leaf or a fruit with their own hands; when about to eat bread, it is said that they thus addressed it:—"It was not I who reaped, or ground, or baked thee; may they who did so be reaped, and ground, and baked in their turn!"^t While the Elect ate, the particles of divine essence contained in their food were set free: thus, says St. Augustine, did Manes make man the saviour of Christ.^u But the effect of other men's eating was to confine the heavenly particles in the bonds of matter; and hence it was inferred that, although a Manichæan might relieve a beggar with money, it would be impious to give him food.^x

It was taught that the natural man, born after the flesh, was not the work of God; but the new man, the believer, who, in St. Paul's words, "after God is created in righteousness and true holiness."^y By those who should obey the precepts of Christ and of Manes, the evil elements of their nature would at length be shaken off; but, although penitence atoned for sin, the work of purgation could not be finished in this life. The sun and the moon were "two ships" for the conveyance of the elect souls to bliss; on leaving the body such souls were transferred to the sun by the revolution of a vast wheel with twelve buckets; the sun, after purging them by his rays, delivered them over to the moon, where they were for fifteen days to undergo a further cleansing by water; and they were then to be received into the primal light.^z The less sanctified souls were to return to earth in other forms—some of them after undergoing intermediate tortures.^a Their new forms were to be such as would subject them to retribution for the misdeeds of their past life,^b so that one who had killed any animal would be changed into a creature of the same kind, while those who had reaped, or ground, or baked, were themselves to become wheat, and undergo the like;^c and thus the purgation of souls was to be carried on in successive migrations until they should become fitted to enter into the bliss

^s Aug. de Hæres. 46, c. 37.

^t Disp. 9; Cyrill. Hierosol. Catech. vi. 33; Epiph. lxvi. 53; Aug. de Mor. Man. 57; Theod. Hær. i. 26 (p. 214, ^b).

^u "Christum, non jam salvatorem vestrum, sed a vobis salvandum," etc. C. Faust. ii. 5. Comp. adv. Hær. 46, col. 35; Pusey, 336-7.

^x Aug. de Mor. Man. 51-3.

^y Ephes. iv. 24; Faustus, ap. Aug. c. Faust. xxiv. 1.

^z Disp. 8; Tit. Bostr. pp. 69, 136, seqq.; Theodor. Hier. i. 26 (p. 213, c.). These authorities do not, however, alto-

gether agree. The changes in the moon's appearance were explained by its receiving and discharging the freights of souls (Disp. 8). The twelve buckets are supposed to mean the signs of the zodiac (Baur, 295). For the strange tenets of the Manichæans as to the intercourse of spirits in the air, see Disp. 8, p. 56; Aug. de Natura Boni, 44.

^a Disp. 10.

^b This was part of the Buddhist system. Lassen, 'Indische Alterthumskunde,' ii. 10.

^c Ibid. 9.

of the Elect.^d When this world should have completed its course, it would be burnt into an inert mass, to which those souls which had chosen the service of evil would be chained, while the powers of darkness would be for ever confined to their own dismal region.^e

Manes represented the Old Testament as a work of the powers of darkness. He attacked its morality and its representations of God, dwelt on its alleged inconsistency with the New Testament, and denied that it prophesied of Christ.^f The Gospel, it was said, was intended chiefly for Gentiles; and on Gentiles the Jewish prophets could have no claim, inasmuch that it would be more reasonable to listen to the oracles of the Sibyl or of Hermes Trismegistus;^g those who should give heed to the prophets would die eternally.^h Christ had left his revelation imperfect, promising to send the Paraclete for its completion; and St. Paul had spoken (1 Cor. xiii. 4) of the further knowledge which was thus to be given. The promise, according to Manes, was fulfilled in himself;ⁱ but, in claiming to be the Paraclete, he did not imply the full blasphemy which such a pretension suggests to a Christian mind.^k He rejected the Acts of the Apostles as opposed to his doctrine on this subject;^l he declared the Gospels to be the work of unknown persons who lived long after the apostolic times,^m and also to be much adulterated, so that he might assume the right of correcting them after his own fancy;ⁿ and he set aside such other portions of the New Testament as were inconsistent with his scheme.^o The sect relied on some apocryphal Gospels and other forgeries of a like kind;^p but their chief sources of belief were the writings of the founder,^q and they claimed the liberty of interpreting the New Testament in accordance with the teaching of their Paraclete, in like manner as the orthodox interpreted the older Scriptures by the light of the Christian reve-

^d Mosh. 859-869; Neand. ii. 177.

^e Disp. 11; Ep. Fundamenti, quoted by the author of the treatise 'De Fide adv. Manichæos,' c. 5, in Append. to vol. viii. of St. Augustine.

^f Disp. 10, 11, 46. On the rejection of the prophecies see Aug. c. Faust. xii. The text in which our Lord says that Moses wrote of Him (St. John, v. 46) was also rejected (ibid. xvi. 1-8). The objections to the Old Testament are discussed at great length in the xxiind book of the same treatise. See too Beausob. pt. II. l. i. c. 3.

^g Faustus, ap. Aug. c. Faust. xiii. 1.

^h Disp. 13.

ⁱ Disp. 26-8; Epiph. lxvi. 61; Theodor. Hær. i. 26, p. 214, c. The Manichæan Felix says that he believes in the Para-

clete, because he had taught things which the apostles did not know, as "the beginning, the middle, and the end." Aug. Acta c. Felice, i. 9.

^k Baur, 471-2. Beausobre (i. 264-7) denies that he made such a claim at all.

^l Aug. c. Felic. i. 14; De Utilitate Credendi, 7; c. Adimant. xvii. 5.

^m Aug. c. Faust. xxii. 2.

ⁿ Tit. Bostr. p. 139.

^o Baur, 384.

^p Aug. de Hæres. 46, col. 38; adv. Faust. xxii. 79. The forged writings were in part the same which had been used by some of the Gnostics. See Beausob. pt. II. l. i. c. 7; l. ii. cc. 1-6.

^q Beausob. pt. II. l. ii. c. 7; Mosh. 742-3, 746, 749-753, 825, 830-1; Neand. ii. 189.

lation.^r They denounced the idea of symbolism in religion,^s and made it their especial boast that their opinions were agreeable to reason—that their converts were emancipated from the bondage of authority and faith.^t

The Manichæans were divided into *Elect* and *Hearers*. The former class professed a high degree of ascetic sanctity. They were bound by the “three seals”—“of the mouth, of the hand, and of the bosom;”^u they were to live in poverty, celibacy, and abstinence; they were not allowed even to gather the fruits of the earth for themselves, but were supported and served by the Hearers, who were obliged by the fear of the severest punishments after death to supply all their necessities.^x The Hearers were not subject to such rigid rules; they were forbidden to kill animals, but were allowed to eat flesh^y and to drink wine, to marry, and to engage in the usual occupations of life.^z At a later time, charges of hypocrisy and gross sensuality were freely brought against the Manichæans, notwithstanding their pale and mortified appearance; nor do these charges appear to have been without substantial foundation.^a

The Manichæan hierarchy consisted of a *Chief*, twelve *Masters*, and seventy-two bishops, with priests and deacons under them.^b The worship of the sect, simple and naked,^c agreeably to its Persian origin, was in many points studiously opposed to that of the Church—as in the rejection or disregard of the Christian festivals,^d and in observing the Lord’s Day as a fast.^e The anniversary of the heresiarch’s death, in the month of March, was the great festival of their year.^f In prayer the Manichæans turned towards the sun.^g The Hearers were allowed to listen to the reading of Manes’ books, but did not receive any explanation of their meaning;^h the worship of the Elect was shrouded in

^r Aug. c. Faust. xxxii. 6.

^s Aug. c. Faust. xv. 5.

^t Aug. de Util. Credendi, i. 2, 21; Pusey, 326-7.

^u Aug. de Mor. Manich. 10, seqq.; Baur, 249, seqq. “Quum os nomino, omnes sensus, qui sunt in capite, intelligi volo; quum autem manum, omnem operationem—[the Oriental notion of an entire abstinence from active occupation (Ritter, v. 171-2)]—quum sinum, omnem libidinem seminale.” c. 10.

^x Disp. 9; Aug. de Hæres. 46, col. 37.

^y Among the Buddhists it is unlawful for the Lamas to kill any animal; but they may freely eat of those which are killed by the “black men” or laity.

(Huc, i. 341.) Manes, it will be observed, carried the restriction lower.

^z Aug. Ep. ccxxxvi. 2; c. Faust. xx. 23.

^a Aug. de Mor. Manich. 20-1; Tillem. iv. 374-5, 377; Mosh. 846, 899; Pusey, 331-2.

^b Aug. de Hæres. 46, col. 38. See Baur, 297-304.

^c Faust. ap. Aug. c. Faust. xx. 3.

^d Augustine says that they paid little regard to Easter, because they did not believe the reality of the Saviour’s death. C. Ep. Fundam. 9.

^e Aug. Ep. xxxvi. 12.

^f Aug. c. Faust. xviii. 5.

^g Aug. c. Fortunatum, 3.

^h Aug. c. Ep. Fundam. 6.

mystery, which naturally gave rise to rumours of abominable rites.ⁱ St. Augustine, after having been nine years a Hearer, could only state that the Eucharist was celebrated among the Elect; of the manner of administration he had been unable to learn anything,^k although, as the principles of the Manichæans forbade them to use wine, he taunts them with "acknowledging their God in the grape, and refusing to acknowledge Him in the cup."^l Baptism is supposed to have been administered with oil; that with water was held indifferent, if it was not forbidden.^m

Manichæism soon spread into the West. Its appearance in proconsular Africa, within a few years after the founder's death, is attested by an edict of Diocletian,ⁿ which condemns the doctrine, not as Christian, but as coming from the hostile kingdom of Persia. This document orders that the teachers and their books should be burnt; that the disciples should be sent to the mines, or, if persons of rank, should be banished; and that in either case their property should be seized. In St. Augustine's time the sect was numerous in Italy and in Africa; some of its secret members were even among the clergy of the Church.^o Notwithstanding frequent and severe edicts of the Christian emperors, Manichæism continued to exist, and we shall have occasion to notice it hereafter among the heresies of the middle ages.^p

The persecuting edict of Aurelian was revoked by his successor Tacitus; and for many years the Church was undisturbed by the secular power. In the reign of Diocletian it had attained an unexampled degree of prosperity. Its buildings began to display architectural splendour; they were furnished with sacred vessels of silver and gold. Converts flocked in from all ranks; even the wife of the emperor, and his daughter Valeria, married to his colleague Galerius, appear to have been among the number. Christians held high offices in the state and in the imperial household. Provincial governments were entrusted to them, with a privilege of exemption from all such duties as might be incon-

ⁱ Aug. Hær. 46, col. 36.

^k Ibid.

^l "In cupa." C. Faust. xx. 13.

^m Aug. de Hæres. 46, col. 38; ad Bonifac. ii. 3; Bayle, art. *Manichéens*, note B.; Mosh. 886; Neander, ii. 193; Gieseler, I. i. 300. Baur thinks that baptism, whether with oil or by mere imposition of hands, was the form of initiation for the elect. 278.

ⁿ Gieseler, I. i. 311. It is mentioned

by the writer known as Ambrosiaster, (Comm. in 2 Tim. iii. 7, ap. Ambros. t. II. ii. 493.) Baronius dates it in 287; Neander (i. 199; ii. 195) and Guericke (i. 290) in 296. Gieseler (I. i. 311) gives 287 as the date, but with a mark of doubt.

^o Aug. Ep. 236; Tillem. iv. 402-4. See book II. chapters viii. and xi.

^p Matter, iii. 95.

sistent with their religion.^q Along with these advances in temporal prosperity, the contemporary historian^r laments that there had been a decay of faith and love; that hypocrisy and ambition had crept in; that pastors and people alike were distracted by jealousies and dissensions. But it has been well observed that the very offences are a token of progress, since "it is the strongest proof of the firm hold of a party, whether religious or political, upon the public mind, when it may offend with impunity against its own primary principles. That which at one time is a sign of incurable weakness, or approaching dissolution, at another seems but the excess of healthful energy, and the evidence of unbroken vigour."^s

It was in the year 284 that Diocletian assumed the purple. In 286 he associated with himself Maximian, as *Augustus*; and in 292 Galerius and Constantius were added to the number of princes, with the inferior title of *Cæsars*.^t Disregarding the republican forms under which the imperial power had hitherto been veiled, Diocletian assumed the state of an eastern monarch,^u established a new system of administration, with offices and titles of a pomp before unknown among the Romans, and removed his court from Rome to Nicomedia, on the Asiatic shore of the Propontis. The ancient capital ceased to be the centre of government; the senate sank into neglect and insignificance.^x In the partition of the empire, Diocletian reserved for himself Thrace, the Asiatic provinces, and Egypt; Maximian, whose residence was at Milan, received Italy and Africa; Galerius had Illyria and the countries on the Danube; Gaul, Spain, and Britain were assigned to Constantius.^y

The priests and others who were interested in the maintenance of the pagan system, began to apprehend that they might lose their hold on the empire. Maximian and Galerius were, indeed, hostile to Christianity, yet it may have seemed possible that the Cæsar might be influenced by his wife Valeria; while Diocletian was indifferent, and Constantius openly favoured the Christians.^z Attempts were therefore made to work on the superstitious feelings of Diocletian by means of omens and oracles. On one occasion, when Apollo was consulted in his presence, the answer was given, not, as was usual, through the priest, but by the god

^q Euseb. viii. 1; Gibbon, i. 575.

^r Euseb. l. c.

^s Milman, ii. 261.

^t Gibbon, i. 362-3.

^u Eutropius, ix. 26; De Mortib. Persec.

⁷; Euseb. Chron. A.D. 296, ap. Hieron viii. 661.

^x Gibbon, i. 388-9; Gfrörer, ii. 3-9.

^y Gibbon, i. 364.

^z Mosh. 911-3.

himself in a hollow voice from the depths of the cave—that, on account of the righteous who were on the earth, the oracles were restrained from answering truly; and, in reply to Diocletian's inquiries, the priests explained that these words pointed at the Christians.^a At another time, when the emperor was with his army in the east, it was announced that the entrails of the victims did not exhibit the usual marks by which the future was signified. The sacrifice was several times repeated without any better result; and at last the chief soothsayer declared that the presence of profane persons—that is to say of Christians—was the cause of its failure.^b

It was in the army that Christians were most especially liable to be noted, and that the first attempts on their fidelity were made.^c The story of the Theban Legion,^d which is referred to the year 286, although extravagantly fabulous in its details, may possibly have some foundation of truth. This legion, it is said, consisting of 6600 Christians, was summoned from the east for the service of Maximian in Gaul. When near the Alpine town of Agaunum, which takes its modern name from their leader, St. Maurice, the soldiers discovered that they were to be employed in the persecution of their brethren in the faith, and refused to march onwards for such a purpose. By order of Maximian, who was in the neighbourhood, they were twice decimated. But this cruelty was unable to shake the firmness of the survivors; and Maurice, in the name of his comrades, declared to the emperor that, while ready to obey him in all things consistent with their duty to God, they would rather die than violate that duty. The emperor, exasperated by their obstinacy, ordered his other troops to close around them; whereupon the devoted band laid down their arms and peacefully submitted to martyrdom. There are other and more authentic records of military confessors and martyrs in the early years of Diocletian's reign; but, whatever persecutions or annoyances may have then been

^a Euseb. Vit. Const. ii. 50–1, on the authority of Constantine. Mosheim (914) supposes the word *righteous* to be used ironically, as meaning persons who pretended to especial righteousness.

^b The Christians had marred the sacrifice by secretly crossing themselves. (Lactantius *De Mortibus Persecutorum*, 10.) The book '*De Mortibus Persecutorum*,' bearing the name of Lucius Cæcilus, was discovered in MS. by Baluze, who identified it with a work '*De Persecutione*,' mentioned by St.

Jerome (*De VV. Illust.* 80) among the writings of Lucius Cælius Firmianus Lactantius. The title given by St. Jerome is more correct as a description of the contents than the other, and Baluze's conjecture is most commonly adopted, although it has not been unquestioned. Gieseler, I. i. 347.

^c Euseb. viii. 4; Gibbon, i. 578–9.

^d Eucherius (bishop of Lyons, about 530) '*Passio Agaunensium Martyrum*,' ap. Migne, l. 827. Schröckh, iv. 271–4; Gieseler, i. 263; Rettberg, i. 94.

experienced by Christian soldiers, it does not appear that any general attempt to force their conscience was made before the year 298, when it was ordered that all persons in military service, or in public employment of any kind, should offer sacrifice to the gods.^f

Galerius, during a visit which he paid to Diocletian at Nicomedia in the winter of 302-3, endeavoured to excite the elder emperor against the Christians. For a time Diocletian withstood his importunity—whether sincerely, or only with a wish to gain credit for a show of reluctance, is doubtful. The advice of some lawyers and military officers was then called in (as is said to have been the emperor's custom when he wished to avoid the odium of any unpopular measure), and a persecution was decreed.^g On the 23rd of February—the great Roman festival of the *Terminalia*—an attack was made on the church of Nicomedia, which was situated on a height, and overlooked the palace. The heathen functionaries, on entering, found nothing to seize except the copies of the sacred books, which they burnt. It was then proposed to set fire to the building; but Diocletian, out of fear that the flames might spread, preferred to give it over to the soldiery for destruction, and by their exertions the church was in a few hours entirely demolished.^h

Next day the imperial edict was issued. It ordained that all who should refuse to sacrifice should lose their offices, their property, their rank, and civil privileges; that slaves persisting in the profession of the Gospel should be excluded from the hope of liberty;ⁱ that Christians of all ranks should be liable to torture; that all churches should be razed to the ground; that religious meetings should be suppressed; and that the Scriptures and service-books should be committed to the flames.^k No sooner had the edict been publicly displayed than a Christian, who is described as a man of station, tore it down, uttering at the same time words of insult against the emperors. He was roasted at a slow fire, and bore his sufferings with a stern composure which astonished and mortified his executioners.^l

Within a fortnight the palace of Nicomedia was twice discovered to be on fire. The cause is unknown;^m but on the second

^f Baron. 298. 1, and Pagi's note; Burton, ii. 421; Neand. i. 203-4.

^g De Mort. Persec. 11; Mosh. 920-1; Gibbon, i. 579-581.

^h De Mort. Persec. 12.

ⁱ This—agreeably to Rufinus' translation—is the interpretation generally put on the words in Eusebius:—*ταὺς ἐν*

οἰκισταῖς ἐλευθερίας περιεῖναι. Tillem. v. 19-20; Mosh. 925; Gieseler, I. i. 264.

^k Euseb. viii. 2; De Mort. Pers. 13. *τὰς γραφὰς* no doubt included the service-books.

^l Euseb. viii. 5; De Mort. Persec. 13.

^m Some ascribe it to lightning; the author of De Mort. Persec. (14) to the

occasion, at least,ⁿ the guilt was charged on the Christians. Diocletian was greatly alarmed and incensed. He compelled his wife and daughter to sacrifice, and proceeded to administer the same test to the members of his household and to the inhabitants of the city. Some of the most confidential chamberlains, who were Christians, were put to death, after having endured extreme tortures. Many other Christians, among whom was Anthimus, bishop of Nicomedia,^o also suffered martyrdom.

The edict was soon carried into execution throughout the empire. The churches were for the most part demolished; in some cases the furniture was carried out and burnt, and the buildings were shut up, or were converted to profane uses.^p The attempt to exterminate the Scriptures was a new feature in this persecution.^q Many Christians suffered death for refusing to deliver them up; those who complied were branded by their brethren as *Traditors*—a term which we shall have occasion to notice hereafter.^r As the officials were unable to distinguish the sacred books from other Christian writings, many documents perished, to the irreparable loss of ecclesiastical history.^s In some cases, however, the destruction of these arose from the forbearance of the authorities, who disliked the task imposed on them, and were willing to accept any books that might be offered, without inquiring whether they were those which the Christians regarded as sacred. Thus, when Mensurius, bishop of Carthage, had withdrawn the copies of the Scriptures from his church, and had placed some heretical writings in their room, the pro-consul Anulinus, on being informed of the pious fraud, refused to make any further search;^t and instances are recorded in which magistrates even hinted to the Christians that a substitution of this kind would be admitted. Such connivance was the more remarkable, if it is correct to suppose that negligence in execution of the edict was punishable even with death.^u On the

malice of Galerius, who wished to accuse the Christians. Tillemont (*Hist. des Emp.* iv. 45) and Mosheim (pp. 930–1) attempt to reconcile these statements by the very improbable supposition that the fire was partly caused by lightning and partly by human agency. Gibbon (i. 583–4) insinuates suspicions against the Christians; but his editor, Dean Milman, remarks that, “had it been done by a Christian, it would probably have been a fanatic, who would have avowed and gloried in it.” *Comp. Hist. of Christianity*, ii. 277.

ⁿ See Mosh. 931.

^o Euseb. viii. 6; De Mort. Persec. 15.

^p Gibbon, i. 585–6.

^q Antiochus had attempted to destroy the Jewish scriptures. 1 Maccab. i. 56–7.

^r See the account of the Donatists in book II. c. 1.

^s Mosh. 924.

^t Augustin. *Brevic. Collat. c. Donat.* iii. 25.

^u As Mosheim (923) infers from some words of St. Augustine, *Brevic. Collat. c. Donatists*, iii. 27, 32.

other hand, there were governors who gladly seized the opportunity of venting their enmity against the Church, and carried on the work of persecution with a severity which exceeded the imperial orders.^x

Some troubles in Armenia and Syria, which were falsely charged on the Christians, afforded a pretext for a second edict, by which it was ordered that their teachers should be arrested. In consequence of this, as Eusebius informs us, the prisons were filled with bishops and clergy, so that no room could be found for the malefactors by whom they were commonly occupied.^y A third edict, issued in the same year which had witnessed the beginning of the persecution, directed that the prisoners should be required to sacrifice, and, in case of refusal, should be exposed to a variety of tortures;^z and a fourth, in the following year, extended this order to Christians of every class.^a

On the 1st of May, 305, Diocletian abdicated the empire at Nicomedia, and Maximian, in reluctant submission to the influence of his colleague and benefactor, performed a like ceremony of resignation at Milan.^b Constantius and Galerius now succeeded to the highest dignity, and two new Cæsars, Maximin and Severus, were associated with them. For some years the imperial power was the subject of contentions, changes, and partitions: at one time there were no fewer than six emperors—in the east, Galerius, Maximin, and Licinius; in the west, Maximian, who had resumed his power, with his son Maxentius, and his son-in-law Constantine, the son and successor of Constantius.^c Meanwhile the condition of the Christians throughout the empire varied according to the character of its several rulers.

Constantius, while he held the subordinate dignity of Cæsar, destroyed the churches in his dominions, out of deference to the authority of the elder emperors; but he protected Christians, and entertained many of them in his court.^d On his elevation to the rank of Augustus, he befriended them more openly;^e and in this he was followed still more decidedly by A.D. 305. Constantine, from the time of his accession in 306.^f

^x Mosh. 933; Neand. i. 208-9.

^y Euseb. viii. 6.

^z Ibid.; Mosh. 929, 934. As the Christians were proof against the usual tortures, new kinds were to be devised. No one of the edicts enacted the punishment of death; but through the zeal of officials, under various pretexts, it was often inflicted. Mosheim, 938-941; Schröckh, iv. 482.

^a Euseb. de Martyribus Palæst. 3.

^b De Mort. Persec. 18-9; Gibbon, i. 397.

^c Ibid. 404-418.

^d De Mort. Persec. 15.

^e Mosheim (952) argues that he issued an edict in their favour; but see Schröckh, v. 40.

^f De Mort. Persec. 24.

Galerius persecuted with great zeal until, in the year 311, having found his cruelty utterly ineffectual towards the suppression of the Gospel, and feeling himself sinking under a loathsome and excruciating disease, he issued, in his own name, and in those of Licinius and Constantine, an edict by which Christians were allowed to exercise their religion, and to rebuild their churches, provided that they refrained from doing anything against the discipline of the state; and he concluded with the remarkable request that they would offer up prayers for his safety.^s There can be little doubt that in this change of policy the emperor was influenced by other motives than that pity for the perversity of the Christians, and that regard for the unity of his subjects, which were professed in the edict. Perhaps his bodily sufferings may have been aggravated by remorse for the cruelties which he had committed; or it may have been that, despairing of other relief, he sought to obtain a chance of recovery through the favour of the God of Christians,—regarding him as a power of the same class with the multitude of heathen deities.^h

In Italy and in Africa the persecution was severe during the reign of Maximian. When his son, Maxentius, assumed the government of those countries, although the Christians suffered from the usurper's tyranny, in common with his other subjects, they were not molested on account of their religion; he even pretended to favour them. For it was now felt that they were an important element in the state, and princes who had no regard for their religion might nevertheless be desirous of securing their political support.ⁱ

The most violent of all the persecutors was Maximin, who in the year 305 received the sovereignty of Syria and Egypt, and on the death of Galerius added Asia Minor to his dominions. Brutal, ferocious, and ignorant, he was a slave to pagan superstition, and a dupe to priests, soothsayers, and professors of magical arts.^k Galerius did not venture to include his name in the edict for toleration of the Gospel; but Maximin, although he declined to publish it in his dominions, gave verbal orders to a like effect. At the same time, however, he took measures for restoring the splendour of the heathen worship, and six months later he issued an edict for a renewal of persecution—professing to yield to petitions from Antioch and other cities, which, according

^s Ibid. 33-4; Euseb. viii. 17.

^h Mosh. 957-8; Schröckh, v. 45; Milman, ii. 285-6.

Euseb. viii. 14; Mosh. 954; Gibbon,

i. 422-4, 589; Beugnot, i. 45.

^k Euseb. ix. 9; De Mort. Persec. 36; Gibbon, i. 591-3.

to the Christian writers of the age, had been instigated by himself.¹ It was required that all his subjects, even to the infants at the breast, should offer sacrifice; that provisions in the markets should be sprinkled with the libations, and that guards should be placed at the doors of the public baths, with a charge to defile in the same manner those who were about to go forth after having performed their ablutions.^m Calumny too was employed to discredit the Christian religion. Forged 'Acts of Pilate' were circulated, and were introduced into schools as lesson-books, so that the very children had their mouths filled with blasphemies against the Saviour. Women of the vilest character were suborned to confess abominations of which they pretended to have partaken among the Christians.ⁿ The edict was engraved on plates of brass, and was set up in every city. In it Maximin boasted of the blessings which had followed on his measures for the revival of paganism—success in war, fruitful seasons, immunity from the plagues of earthquake, storm, and sickness.^o But soon after the renewal of persecution, this boast was signally falsified by the appearance of famine and pestilence, which fearfully wasted his dominions. And in this time of trial, as before on similar occasions, the power of Christian faith and love was admirably manifested. The believers, while they shared in the common visitation, distinguished themselves from the multitude by their behaviour under it, hazarding their lives in ministering to the sick and burying the dead who were abandoned by their own nearest kindred.^p

The varieties of torture exercised during the persecution need not be here detailed. On the whole, the Christians endured their sufferings with a noble constancy and patience, although, in addition to the weakness of the Traditors, there were some who denied the faith, and others who provoked their death by violent and fanatical conduct.^a The pagans who witnessed their sufferings

¹ De Mort. Persec. 36; Euseb. ix. 1-2. See Neander, iii. 3-4.

^m Euseb. de Martyribus Palæst. 9.

ⁿ Euseb. ix. 5-7.

^o Ibid. 7.

^p Ibid. 8.

^a Mosh. 941-2. One form of fanaticism is denounced by the 60th canon of the Council of Eliberis (A.D. 305?). "Si quis idola frerit, et ibidem fuerit occisus; quatenus in evangelio scriptum non est, neque invenitur sub apostolis unquam factum, placuit in numero eum non recipi martyrum." From the 25th of the same canons, and the 9th canon of Arles (A.D. 314) it would seem that con-

fessors at this time claimed the privilege of granting letters which interfered with the discipline of the church—whether the letters of forgiveness, which had been common in St. Cyprian's time, or (as appears more likely) letters of recommendation to communion, which it was the privilege of bishops only to grant to such members of their flock as were about to visit other churches. The Councils order that the letters shall be taken away from the bearers, and that "litteræ communicatoriæ" shall be given instead of them.

were at length disgusted by such profusion of bloodshed and cruelty; the persecutors themselves became weary of slaying, and resorted to other punishments—such as mutilation of the limbs, plucking out an eye, employing bishops and other eminent persons in degrading occupations, and sending large numbers of all classes to labour in unwholesome mines.^r

The persecution altogether lasted ten years, although after the first two it was but little felt in the west. Gibbon, with an evident desire to state as low as possible the number of those who were put to death, reckons them at two thousand;^s of bodily torments short of death, and of the immense wretchedness of other kinds which must have been experienced by the members of the obnoxious community during that long period of terror, the historian disdains to take any account whatever.

Among the martyrs, the most celebrated for station^t or character were—Peter, bishop of Alexandria;^u Lucian, a presbyter of Antioch, who in early life had been connected with Paul of Samosata, but afterwards returned to the orthodox communion, and distinguished himself by his labours on the Scriptures;^x Pamphilus, founder of the library of Cæsarea, celebrated for his zeal in multiplying and correcting copies of the sacred text, for his writings in defence of Origen, and for his intimate friendship with the historian Eusebius;^y and Methodius, bishop of Tyre, the opponent of Pamphilus in the Origenistic controversy.^z In addition to those whose names are recorded in authentic history, a great number of martyrs enjoying a general or a local celebrity are referred to this period^a—as St. Sebastian and St. Agnes, who are said to have suffered at Rome; St. Januarius, of Naples; St. Cosmus and St. Damian, patrons of the medical art; St. Vincent, of Saragossa; in France, St. Denys (Dionysius), of Paris, St. Clement,^b of Metz, St. Quentin, and many others; St. Gereon and his companions, whose relics are shown in a singular and beautiful church at Cologne;^c St. George, the patron of England. To the earlier

^r De Mort. Persec. 36; Euseb. viii. 12; De Mart. Palæst. 10.

^s i. 596–9. Dean Milman (note, p. 596) remarks on this unfairness.

^t The martyrdom of Marcellinus, bishop of Rome, and the story of his appearance in the Council of Sinuessa, are both unquestionably fabulous. See Hard. i. 217–220; Nat. Alex. vi. Dissert. 20; Tillem. v. 615–6; Dupin, ii. 303.

^u Euseb. ix. 6.

^x Ibid.; Hieron. de VV. Illustr. 77; Routh, Rel. Sac. iv. 3–4.

^y Euseb. vi. 32; vii. 32; De Mart. Palæst. 7, 11; Hieron. 75; Routh, iii. 487.

^z Hieron. 83; Neander, ii. 496–7.

^a See Greg. Turon. de Gloria Martyrum, l. i.; Tillem. tt. iv. v.

^b St. Clement, however, is referred by some (as Chaussier, in Patrol. xcv. 673) to the apostolic age.

^c The story of these martyrs is an offshoot from that of the Theban Legion. Rettberg, Kircheng. Deutschlands, i. 101, seqq.

part of Diocletian's reign, before the edict of 303, belongs the story of the British protomartyr St. Alban.^d

After his victory over Maxentius, in the end of October, 312, Constantine published an edict in favour of the Christians; and by a second, which he issued in conjunction with Licinius, from Milan, in June, 313, he established for them, in common with all other bodies, complete religious freedom,—ordering that the churches and other property of the community should be restored to them, and inviting persons who might suffer by the restitution to seek compensation from the public purse.^e In consequence of the overthrow of Maximin by Licinius (April 30, 313), the benefits of this edict were speedily extended to the whole empire. The fury of the defeated tyrant, who had vowed that, if victorious, he would exterminate the Christian name,^f was now turned into an opposite direction; in his despair he put to death many of the priests and soothsayers on whose counsels he had relied, and he proclaimed an entire toleration of the Christians—laying the blame of his former severities against them on the judges and governors, whom he attempted to represent as having misunderstood his intentions. Maximin died miserably at Tarsus, in August, 313; and in the contrast between the prosperity of the princes who had befriended them and the calamitous ends of their oppressors, the Christians could not but suppose that they discovered tokens of the Divine judgment.^g

The change in the relations of the Christian community to the imperial power opens a new period in ecclesiastical history.

^d Beda, *Hist. Eccl.* i. 7.

^e *De Mort. Pers.* 48; *Euseb.* x. 5. The first edict, which is lost, was defective in some respects, as to which it was amended by the second. But from the obscurity of Constantine's language, it is very doubtful in what the defectiveness of the earlier edict consisted. See

Valois' note on *Eusebius*; *Pagi*, iii. 539; *Mosheim*, 958-8; *Schröckh*, v. 91; *Neander*, iii. 17-19.

^f *De Mort. Pers.* 46.

^g *Ibid.* 49; *Euseb. Hist. Eccl.* ix. 9-10; *Vita Const.* i. 57-9; *Gibbon*, i. 435-6, 595; *Milman*, ii. 297.

CHAPTER VIII.

SUPPLEMENTARY.

I. *Progress of the Gospel.*

(1.) THERE is reason to believe that, by the end of the third century, the Gospel had been made known, in some degree, to almost all the nations with which the Romans had intercourse, although we have very little information as to the details of its progress, or as to the agency by which this was effected. From an early period Christian writers are found appealing triumphantly to the extension of their brotherhood. "There exists not," says Justin Martyr, "a people, whether Greek or barbarian, or any other race of men, by whatsoever appellation or manners they may be distinguished, however ignorant of arts or of agriculture, whether they dwell under tents or wander about in covered waggons, among whom prayers [and thanksgivings] are not offered up in the name of a crucified Jesus to the Father and Creator of all things."^a Irenæus declares that, in his day, many barbarous nations had the traditional faith of the Church written in their hearts by the Holy Spirit, without the instrumentality of paper and ink.^b Tertullian, in reckoning up the nations which had received the Gospel, names, in addition to those which were represented at Jerusalem on the great day of Pentecost,—Getulians, Moors, Spaniards, Gauls, Britons beyond the Roman pale, Sarmatians, Dacians, Germans, and Scythians.^c Origen speaks of "myriads of barbarians," even "the greatest part of the barbarian world," as subject to Christ.^d Arnobius, an eloquent African apologist, who wrote about the year 304, in one passage mentions widely distant nations among which Christians were found,^e and elsewhere asserts that there was then no nation of barbarians which had not been affected by the softening influence of the Gospel.^f Such passages are not,

^a Dial. c. Tryph. 117, as freely translated by Gibbon, i. 519.

^b Adv. Hær. III. iv. 2. *

^c Adv. Judæos, c. vii. From the place here given to the Germans, Rückert infers that Tertullian meant to speak of

the countries on the Danube, while Irenæus (quoted below) meant those on the Rhine. i. 9-10.

^d C. Celsum, i. 27; ii. 14.

^e Adv. Gentes, i. 16 (Patrol. iv.).

^f ii. 5.

indeed, free from rhetorical vagueness and exaggeration; but, after all reasonable abatement, they must be admitted as evidence that, in the times when they were written, the faith of Christ had been widely diffused, and in many quarters had penetrated beyond the bounds of civilization.^g

Although the narrative of the preceding chapters has been for the most part confined to the countries bordering on the Mediterranean, we have seen in the accounts of Pantænus and Origen,^h notices of Christianity in regions which are vaguely designated by the names of Arabia and India; and the story of Manes has brought before us the existence of Christian communities in Persia and Mesopotamia.ⁱ The Church of Edessa, whatever may be the value of the statements which ascribe to it an apostolic origin,^k is known to have been firmly established in the middle of the second century;^l and shortly after that date the Edessan Bardesanes witnesses to the propagation of the Gospel in Parthia, Persia, Media, and Bactria.^m It was not until towards the end of the period that it was introduced into Armenia; but the apostle of that country, Gregory, styled the Illuminator, made a convert of the king, Tiridates, and Armenia had the honour of being the first country in which Christianity was adopted as the national religion.ⁿ

From the time when "they which were scattered abroad upon the persecution which arose about Stephen went everywhere preaching the word,"^o the calamities which drove Christians from their homes became the means of spreading the tidings of salvation. We have seen that such consequences followed from the banishment of bishops and clergy under Decius and Valerian;^p and thus it was that the Goths in Mœsia derived their first knowledge of the faith from captives whom they had carried off in inroads on the empire during the reigns of Valerian and Gallienus.^q

Irenæus speaks of churches among the Celts, in Spain, and in Germany.^r His mention of the last of these countries ought, perhaps, to be understood as referring to the Roman province only—the portion within the Rhine; but it is probable that, in the course of the following century, converts had also been won among the barbarous nations to the eastward of that river.^s

^g See Mosh. 203; Kaye on Tertullian, 88.

^h Pp. 87, 102, 105.

ⁱ P. 133. See Beausobre, i. 180.

^k See p. 2.

^l Gibbon, i. 520; Neand. i. 110.

^m Bardes. ap. Euseb. Præp. Evang. vi. 10, p. 280, ed. Viger, Paris, 1628.

ⁿ Wiltsch, i. 52; Milman, ii. 319–322.

^o Acts viii. 4; xi. 19.

^p P. 98; Neand. i. 192.

^q Sozomen, ii. 6.

^r I. x. 2.

^s Mosh. 204, 211; Neand. i. 116–7; Gieseler, i. 160. Rettberg thinks that Irenæus means to speak of Germany be-

Of the early history of Christianity in Gaul very little is known. It is hardly to be supposed that Pothinus and his Asiatic companions were the earliest missionaries who appeared in that country;^t but they were the first of whom any authentic record is preserved, or whose labours had any considerable success.^u Gregory of Tours, who wrote towards the end of the sixth century, states that in the reign of Decius seven missionaries set out from Rome for the conversion of Gaul, and that among them was Dionysius, bishop of Paris,^x who is confounded by later legendary writers with the Areopagite of the Apostolic age.^y That there may have been some such mission about the time which is assigned for it, is not improbable; but the story as told by Gregory is inconsistent with undoubted facts, and the work of the missionaries, if they were really sent into Gaul about the middle of the third century, must have consisted in strengthening and extending the church of that country—not in laying its foundation by the first introduction of the faith.^z

The origin of the British Church is involved in fable. The story of Joseph of Arimathea's preaching,^a and even the correspondence of an alleged British king Lucius with Eleutherius, bishop of Rome^b (about A.D. 167), need not be here discussed. Yet within about thirty years from the supposed date of that correspondence, we meet with the statement already quoted from Tertullian, that the Gospel had made its way into parts of this island which the Romans had never reached,—a statement which may be supposed to indicate that, in the end of the second century, even Scotland had not been unvisited by missionaries. Somewhat later than Tertullian, Origen speaks of Britons, "although divided from our world," as united with Mauritians in the worship of the same One God.^c There can, at least, be no question that under the government of Constantius and his son the British Christians were numerous; and in the Council of Arles, A.D. 314, we find the

yond the Roman dominion, but that his statement is exaggerated. i. 68–72.

^t See p. 32; Blunt, 194–7.

^u Mosh. 210–1; Burton, ii. 349. The Abbé Rohrbacher (iv. 477) stoutly maintains, in the year 1850, that St. Lazarus, St. Martha, and St. Mary Magdalene evangelised Provence! For further proof he refers to a work in two quarto volumes, written expressly on the subject, by the Abbé Faillon, Paris, 1848.

^x Hist. Franc. i. 28.

^y This confusion, although it had begun earlier, was established in the

general belief by Hilduin, abbot of St. Denys, in the reign of Louis the Pious. See vol. ii. book IV. c. 2.

^z Mosh. 211, 449; see Hist. Litt. i. 306, seqq.; Gieseler, I. i. 277.

^a Will. Malmesb. de Antiq. Glastoniensis Ecclesiæ, Patrol. clxxix. 1683.

^b Beda, i. 4; Collier, i. 27–41. Dr. Lappenberg, however, is inclined to favour the story of Lucius. i. 46.

^c In Luc. Hom. 6, t. iii. 939. Cf. Hom. 4 in Ezek., ib. 370; Tract. 28 in Matth., ib. 858.

names of three British bishops—Eborius of York, Restitutus of London, and Adelfius, whose see is generally identified with Lincoln.^d

(2.) The social position of those who embraced the Gospel in the earliest times afforded a theme for the ridicule of Celsus;^e and Gibbon, with evident delight, repeats the taunt that “the new sect was almost entirely composed of the dregs of the populace—of peasants and mechanics, of boys and women, of beggars and slaves.”^f If, as the same writer states, “this very odious imputation seems to be less strenuously denied by the apologists, than it is urged by the adversaries, of the faith,” the cause may probably be found in their sense of its irrelevancy to any question as to the truth of the Gospel,^g and in the feeling which forbade them to imitate, even towards the meanest or the most sinful among those for whom the Saviour had died, the contempt with which the philosophers of heathenism were wont to regard those below them.^h But, as the historian goes on to admit, the reproach of meanness and vulgarity was far from universally applicable to the converts. Among those whom we read of even in the New Testament, were many persons of wealth and station, including some members of the imperial household.ⁱ Among the sufferers in Domitian’s persecution were his own near kinswoman Flavia Domitilla, and her husband the consul Flavius Clemens.^k It was not a mere rhetorical flight when Tertullian, in the end of the second century, told the heathens that his brethren were to be found filling the camp, the assemblies, the palace, and the senate;^l nor can there be any reason for questioning the statement of Origen, that among the converts were men of dignified position, with noble and delicate ladies.^m We have seen that, at a later time, Diocletian’s empress and daughter were believed to be of the number;ⁿ and in the edicts, both of that prince and of his predecessor Valerian, it is assumed that, in many cases, the penalties for professing Christianity would be incurred by persons of wealth and station.^o

^d Hard. i. 267; Collier, i. 59; Mosh. 450–1; Lingard’s Anglo-Saxon Church, i. 6; Lappenberg, i. 48. Adelfius is described as of “*Colonia Londinensium*,” which some writers suppose to be Colchester. (See Soames, 10; Quart. Rev. xcvii. 100.) But *Londinensium* is more commonly regarded as a mistake for *Lindensium*.

^e Orig. c. Cels. i. 27; iii. 55.

^f i. 521.

^g See Minuc. Fel. Octavius, cc. 16, 36.

^h “Nec de ultima statim plebe consistimus

si honores vestros et purpuras recusamus” (c. 31).

ⁱ See Orig. c. Cels. viii. 50.

^j Philipp. iv. 22.

^k The husband was put to death and the wife was banished to the island of Pandataria (Ventotene). Dio Cass. lxxvii. p. 766, ed. Hanov. 1606; Euseb. Chron. A.D. 98, ap. Hieron. viii. 603; Hist. Eccl. iii. 18.

^l Apol. 37.

^m C. Cels. iii. 9.

ⁿ P. 143.

^o See pp. 98, 145.

That the "poor of this world" were often found "rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom of God"—that the preaching of Christ, addressed as it was to all, found more acceptance among the simple than among the wise men of the world—that the Gospel was sometimes introduced into families by the agency of slaves—that female influence was effective in extending it—such statements we need not care to controvert. But we have seen also how, by degrees, the faith won its converts and its advocates among men of the highest ability and cultivation;^p and how the Christian schools came to be frequented even by many of the heathen, on account of the advantages which they offered for a liberal and philosophical education. The very rebukes addressed by Clement, in his 'Pedagogue,' to the Christians of Alexandria prove that he had to deal with a wealthy and luxurious community.^q And, on the whole, there is reason to believe that, while the Gospel had its proselytes in every rank below the throne, "its main strength lay in the middle, perhaps the mercantile, classes."^r

The proportion which the Christians bore to the heathen population of the empire has been very variously estimated. We are not concerned on religious grounds to question Gibbon's calculation,^s that, until their religion was sanctioned by the authority of Constantine, they did not amount to "more than a twentieth part" of the whole; indeed, if all the hindrances to the progress of the Gospel be fairly considered, even such a proportion would deserve to be regarded as a token rather of great than of little success;^t but there can be little doubt that the estimate is by far too low. It would probably be more correct to suppose that the Christians formed about a fifth of the whole body of Roman subjects; in some districts, as in the dominions of Maximin, they were perhaps even the majority.^u

II. *The Hierarchy.*

(1.) The hierarchy of the Church underwent some changes in the course of the second and third centuries. The only order

^p See Arnob. ii. 5.

^q Milman, ii. 264; Blunt on the Fathers, 170, 302.

^r Milman, ib. Compare Niebuhr, Lectures, iii. 323, ed. Schmitz; Blunt on the Fathers, Ser. ii. Lect. 2. The great expenses which the church had to bear are also a proof that it must have had large funds at its command. Blunt, ib. 309, seqq.

^s i. 520.

^t "Si dans les premiers siècles de

notre ère l'homme a été ce qu'il est toujours, une religion qui demandait de tels sacrifices et prescrivait une morale si austère ne pouvait faire que des progrès modérés. C'est tout ce que l'on peut établir à ce sujet." (Matter, Hist. du Christianisme, i. 119.) The writer goes on to say that "at most a fifth" of Constantine's subjects were Christians when the edict of toleration was issued.

^u Maximin, in one of his edicts, says that "almost all" had abandoned the

which existed in the apostolic age, in addition to those of bishops, priests, and deacons, was that of Deaconesses—women (and at first usually widows)^x who were employed in such ministrations to persons of their own sex as were either naturally unsuitable for males, or were so regarded by the customs of the ancient world—especially in the east. Thus, they assisted at the baptism of female converts; they visited the women of the community at their homes; and, by obtaining access to their apartments, from which the clergy were excluded, they had the means of doing much for the advancement of the faith among the middle and higher classes.^y

But in the end of the second, or early in the third, century, several new offices, below the order of deacons, were introduced. These originated in the greater churches, where—partly from a supposed expediency of limiting the number of deacons to that of the apostolical Church at Jerusalem,^z and partly from the importance which the deacons acquired in such communities, as being entrusted with the administration of the public funds—a need was felt of assistance in performing the lower functions of the diaconate, which it is too probable that the deacons had in many cases begun to regard as unworthy of them.^a The first mention of any inferior office is in Tertullian, who speaks of *readers*.^b The fuller organization of the lesser orders comes before us in the epistles of St. Cyprian, and in one of his contemporary, Cornelius, bishop of Rome, who states that the Roman Church then numbered forty-six presbyters, *seven* deacons, *seven subdeacons*, forty-two *acolyths*, and fifty-two *exorcists, readers, and door-keepers*.^c The business of the sub-deacons was to take care of the sacred vessels and to assist the deacons in their secular duties; the acolyths lighted the lamps and attended at the celebration of the sacraments; the exorcists had the charge of the *energumens* or persons who were

worship of their ancestors for the new faith. (Euseb. ix. 9.) See other authorities in Milman, ii. 341; Planck, i. 217; Finlay, i. 151.

^x Thomassin. I. iii. 50. 8; Rothe, *Anfänge d. Christl. Kirche*, 247–251, 256–8; Kaye on Tertullian, 227–9.

^y Neand. i. 162. For deaconesses in later times, see Döllinger, i. 214. They were forbidden by some councils, as Conc. Arausiac. I. A.D. 441, c. 26. But they are to be found long after this, both in the Greek and in the Latin churches; and among the Jacobites the order is still kept up. Augusti, xi. 220–1.

^z See Concil. Neocæsar. A.D. 324, c. 14; Routh, *Rel. Sac.* iv. 207.

^a Bingham, II. xx. 16; iii. 1–3; Mosh. 574; Planck, i. 144–9; Giesel. I. i. 370; Neand. i. 279. From some canons early in the fourth century—as the xviiith of the Nicene Council—it would seem that the deacons were then inclined to encroach on the functions and honours of the presbyters.

^b De Præscr. c. 41. Augusti, however, identifies the subdeacons with the *ὑπηρέται* of the New Testament and the early fathers (xi. 223). The “young men” of Acts v. 6, 10, appear also to have been a class of church-officers. See Mosheim, 124 (who identifies them with the deacons), and Olshausen, *Comment.* in loc.

^c Ap. Euseb. vi. 43.

supposed to be possessed by evil spirits; the readers were employed to read the scriptures in the services of the church.^d

These offices were not universally adopted.^e As to that of exorcist, the Apostolical Constitutions (which represent the eastern system as it was about the end of the third century)^f declare that it is not to be conferred by ordination, as being a special gift of divine grace, and a voluntary exercise of benevolence.^g

(2.) While the ministry of the Church was thus receiving an addition of inferior offices, the authority of its highest members, the bishops, became more defined, and distinctions were introduced into their order. The circumstances of the times required that power should be centralized, as an expedient for strength and safety; moreover, as their flocks increased in numbers and in wealth, and as the clergy subject to them were multiplied, the position of the bishops naturally acquired a greater appearance of outward dignity.^h There seems, however, to be much exaggeration in the statements of some writers, both as to the smallness of the authority which they suppose the episcopate to have originally possessed, and as to the height which it had attained in the course of these centuries.ⁱ Even to the end of the period we meet with nothing like autocratic power in the bishops. They were themselves elected by the clergy and people;^k they consulted with the presbyters in the more private matters, and with the whole body of the faithful in such as concerned the community; even the selection of persons to be ordained for the ministry of the Church was referred to the consent of its members generally.^l

^d Thomassin. ii. 1; Bingham, iii.; Planck, i. 145-8. Socrates (v. 22) says that at Alexandria *catechumens* were allowed to be readers and singers. See Augusti, vi. 156.

^e Martene, ii. 1-2; Giesel. I. i. 368-9.

^f In this Krabbe and Von Drey (see p. 7, n.^s) agree, although their views differ in some other respects. See Krabbe, 123, 212, seqq.; Drey, 19, 45-80, 171-181, 191-2.

^g L. viii. c. 26.

^h Giesel. I. i. 370.

ⁱ Thus Mosheim begs the question as to the original position of the bishops, by saying that in the second century they began to claim authority as successors of the Apostles (269). It is not for me to reconcile this view with the opinion of our late Germanizers, that the Apostles themselves had no official authority. In another place (p. 578) Mosheim gives a very extraordinary interpretation to St.

Cyprian's words, "Ut ecclesia super episcopus constituatur,"—viz. that the Church is *superior* to the bishops. The real meaning—that the Church is *founded* on the bishops—is confirmed by the whole tendency of the passage, and especially by the next words, "et omnis actus ecclesiæ per eosdem præpositos gubernetur." (Ep. 33.) But Mosheim goes on to attempt an explanation of these words in accordance with his own construction of those preceding: "Since the Church is above the bishops, the government ascribed to them can only mean," &c. All this is the more curious, because he represents the author of this supposed avowal as the great usurper of the rights of the presbyters and people.

^j Augusti, xi. 259.

^k Bingham, II. iii. 9; IV. ii.; Mosh. 573-4; Planck, i. 183, 187; Giesel. I. i. 372. See as to Cyprian, p. 128.

From time to time circumstances rendered it desirable that the pastors of neighbouring churches should meet in consultation, agreeably to apostolic precedent. In addition to such occasional synods, the custom of holding regular meetings, twice,^m or at least once a-year, was introduced in the latter part of the second century. The origin of these stated synods appears to have been in Greece, where they were recommended by the analogy of the ancient deliberative assemblies, such as that of the Amphictyons, which still existed;ⁿ and by degrees they were introduced into other countries. The chief city of each district was regarded as the *metropolis*, or mother city.^o There the synods met; the bishop of the place naturally took a lead as president, and he became the representative of his brethren in their communications with other churches.^p Thus the metropolitans acquired a pre-eminence among the bishops; and, although every bishop was still regarded as of equal dignity,—although each was considered to be independent in his own diocese^q (unless, indeed, suspicions of his orthodoxy invited his brethren to interfere for the vindication of the faith, and for the protection of his flock),^r—although each, within his own sphere, retained the direction of the ritual and of indifferent matters in general,—the individual dioceses became practically subject to the decisions of the larger circles in which they were included.^s

A still higher authority than that of ordinary metropolitans was attached to the bishops of the great seats of government, as Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch. The title of *patriarch*, by which these came to be distinguished, was not, however, restricted to them in the period which we are now surveying.^t

The authority of the churches which could trace their foundation to apostles was highly regarded. Irenæus and Tertullian, in arguing

^m Can. Apost. 36.

ⁿ Tert. de Jejuniis, 13; Mosh. 264–7; Planck, i. 94–5.

^o That this view was adopted from the civil divisions of the empire appears from the fact that Cæsarea, and not Jerusalem, was the metropolis of Palestine. Thomassin. I. i. 3. 1; De Marca, I. iii. 2; vi. 1; Beveridge, Codex Can. Vind. II. v. 4; Barrow, 158–160.

^p Planck, i. 81–4.

^q Can. Apost. 33.

^r It was considered that the episcopate was *one*—that every bishop was charged with the care of the whole Church, although, for reasons of convenience, each was especially set over a particular portion of it. It was, there-

fore, the duty of every bishop to maintain the faith wherever it might be assailed, so that, when a bishop erred, his brethren were entitled to intervene. Cyprian's proceedings in the case of Marcian, bishop of Arles, and in that of two Spanish bishops, may be mentioned as instances. Epp. 67–8; Barrow, 159–160; Bingham, II. v. 1; Giesel. I. i. 366; Quart. Rev. xciii. 105–8.

^s Barrow, 160–1; Bingham, II. vi. 1; Mosh. 269, 574; Planck, i. 98; Giesel. I. i. 229, 358–360. See the 9th canon of Antioch, A.D. 341.

^t De Marca, I. iii. 5; Bingham, II. xvii. 6; Planck, I. iii. 5; Giesel. I. i. 361.

with heretics who refused to abide by the words of Scripture under pretence of its having been corrupted, refer them to the tradition of the apostolical churches and to the uninterrupted succession of their bishops, as evidence of the apostolic doctrine.^u In so doing, Tertullian places all such churches on the same level—classing Philippi, Corinth, Thessalonica, and Ephesus with Rome. The great church of the imperial city—the only apostolical church of the west—the channel through which most of the western nations had received the Gospel—founded by the labours and adorned by the martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul—strong in the number of its members, and in the wealth which enabled it not only to maintain a higher degree of state than other churches, but to send large charities to the less opulent brethren in every quarter^x—linked with all other communities by continual intercourse—and preserved by national character from those speculative errors which so greatly disquieted the churches of the east—necessarily became pre-eminent above every other.^y But while this was willingly acknowledged in ordinary circumstances, the pretensions of Rome were firmly resisted whenever such bishops as Victor or Stephen attempted to interfere with the independent rights of their brethren in the episcopate. The history of these centuries clearly shows that the bishops of Rome did not as yet possess any jurisdiction over other churches, or any other authority than the precedence and the influence which naturally resulted from their position.^z

(3.) From the cities, in which it was first planted, Christianity gradually penetrated into the country. When a church was formed in a village or a small town, it was administered by a presbyter, subject to the bishop of the neighbouring city, and in some cases by a *Chorepiscopus* (or country bishop).^a Although this title does not occur before the fourth century, the office which it designates was of much earlier origin.^b The chorepiscopi were subordinate to the bishops of cities, and acted for them in confirming the baptized, in granting letters of communion, in ordaining the clergy of the minor orders, and sometimes, by special permission, the priests and deacons.^c It

^u Iren. iii. 3-4; Tert. de Præscr. 36.

^x Dionys. Corinth. ap. Routh, Rel. Sac. i. 179.

^y "Quoniam pro magnitudine sua debeat Carthaginem Roma præcedere." Cypr. ad Cornel. Ep. xlviii. 2 (Patrol. iii. 728); Barrow, 170; Mosh. 574; Planck, i. 113-7, 627; Neand. i. 284; Giesel. i. 213, 230.

^z Giesel. I. i. 362-3. Some titles which are dwelt on by Romish writers

as showing the elevation of the Romish bishop over others, were in truth common to all bishops. See Field, Of the Church, b. v. c. 41; Thomassin, I. i. 4.

^a Planck, i. 71-4; Giesel. I. i. 358.

^b Mosheim (258) and Neander (i. 281) refer it to the second century; Schröckh (iv. 19) to the third. See Planck, i. 76-8. The first occurrence of the title is in the 13th canon of Ancyra, A.D. 314.

^c Bingham, II. xiv. 6-7.

is a question to what order they belonged. Some writers suppose that they were all bishops; others (among whom are Romanists of high name^d as well as Presbyterians) consider them to have been presbyters; while, according to a third opinion, some were of the one class and some of the other. If we regard the object of their appointment, this last view may seem the most probable. As the chorepiscopi were substitutes of the city bishops, and empowered to discharge some part of their functions, it may in some cases have been sufficient to appoint a presbyter, with authority to perform certain acts which by such delegation might rightly be intrusted to presbyters, although not included in the ordinary presbyterial commission; while in other cases it may have been expedient that the chorepiscopus should be a bishop, although, as being the deputy of another bishop, he was limited in the exercise of his powers.^e

(4.) The right of the Christian clergy to “live by the Gospel”^f was asserted and acknowledged from the first. As the Church became more completely organised, they were withdrawn from secular business,^g and were restricted to the duties of their ministry; in St. Cyprian’s time a clergyman was forbidden even to undertaké the office of executor or guardian.^h Their maintenance was derived from the oblations of the faithful; in some places they received a certain proportion of the whole fund collected for the uses of the Church; in some, as at Carthage, provision was made for them by special monthly collections.ⁱ The amount of income thus obtained was naturally very various in different churches; it would seem that the trading which is sometimes spoken of as a discredit to the clergy, and forbidden by canons, may in many cases have originated, not in covetousness, but in a real need of some further means of subsistence in addition to those provided by the Church.^k

^d e.g. Nat. Alex. viii. 496. See Bingham, II. xiv. 2-4, who himself, like Anglican writers in general, supposes all the chorepiscopi to have been bishops. So too Augusti, xi. 162.

^e See Conc. Antioch. A.D. 341, can. 10; De Marca, II. xiii. 3; Thomassin. II. i. 1; Ducange, s. v. *Chorepiscopus*; Döllinger, i. 46.

^f 1 Cor. ix. 14.

^g Can. Apost. 6.

^h Cyp. Ep. 1; Bingham, V. iv. 1-3.

ⁱ Tertull. Apol. 39; “divisiones mensurnas,” Cyp. Ep. xxxix. 5.

^k See the 18th canon of Eliberis (A.D. 305?); Planck, i. 198-200; Neander, i. 275; Matter, Hist. du Chris-

tianisme, i. 147. Mosheim tells us that the parallel of the Christian with the Jewish hierarchy was not drawn by ecclesiastical writers until after the destruction of Jerusalem by Hadrian; and that they then introduced it with a view of establishing a claim to tithes! The historian seems to forget that it occurs as early as St. Clement’s Epistle to the Corinthians (c. 40), where Neander gets over the passage by his usual expedient of supposing an interpolation (i. 273). The duty of paying first fruits and tithes, as under the Law, was more or less distinctly maintained by some writers of this period, as a matter of conscientious obligation. (See Irenæus, IV.

III. *Rites and Usages.*

(1.) During the earliest years of the Gospel—while the congregations of believers were scanty and poor, and their assemblies were held in continual fear of disturbance on the part of the heathens—although it seems probable that they may have set certain rooms apart for the performance of their worship,¹ it is not to be supposed that any entire buildings can have been devoted exclusively to religious uses. We find, however, that in Tertullian's time churches were already built;^m the notices of them become more frequent in the course of the third century; and, as has been stated in a former chapter,ⁿ a new splendour of structure and ornament was introduced during the long interval of peace which followed after the persecution under Valerian.^o

In these churches a portion was separated from the rest by railings, which were intended to exclude the laity. Within this enclosure were the holy table or altar,^p which was usually made of wood, the pulpit or reading-desk,^q and the seats of the clergy.^r

(2.) In the apostolical times, Baptism was administered immediately on the acknowledgment of Christ by the receiver; but when the Church became more firmly settled, converts were required to pass through a course of training before admission to its communion by this sacrament. Their entry on this training (in which the title of *Christians*^s was already given to them, as well as that of *catechumens*) was marked by a solemn reception, with prayer, the sign of the cross, and imposition of hands.^t The length of the preparatory period was not uniform; the Council of Eliberis (Elvira, near Granada) appoints two years,^u while the

xviii. 2; Origen, in Num. Hom. xi. 1.) But to provide for the clergy by such means was impossible, while converts were few among the agricultural classes. Bingham, V. v. 2.

¹ See 1 Cor. xi. 22; Blunt, 36.

^m Tert. de Idol. 7; de Corona, 3; de Pudic. 4.

ⁿ P. 142.

^o Tillem. iii. 274-6; Bingham, VIII. i. 13-15; Augusti, xi. 338-347.

^p It is a question whether *θυσιαστήριον*, in any of the passages where St. Ignatius uses the word, need be construed as meaning the holy Table. But this use of *ara* and *altare* was fixed before Tertullian's time. See Bingham, VIII. vi. 12; Schröckh, iv. 17-8; Augusti, viii. 167. Socrates says that at Antioch the altar looks (*ἐξῆλθε*) to the west, whereas in

other churches it looked to the east. v. 22.

^q "Pulpitum, id est, tribunal ecclesiæ." Cyr. Ep. 39.

^r Giesel. I. i. 375.

^s See Martene, i. 15; and the so-called 7th canon of the second General Council, A.D. 381.

^t Other ceremonies were afterwards used in some churches. See Martene, i. 12, seqq., who gives full information as to ritual matters, but is not sufficiently careful in marking the distinction of times.

^u Conc. Elib. c. 42. The date of this council is not certain, but was probably about A.D. 305. Hardouin places it in 313; Aguirre, in 303; Mansi, in 309; others as early as 257 or as late as 330. See Dupin, ii. 304; Mariana, iii. 176,

Apostolical Constitutions prescribe three, although with a permission that the term may be shortened in special cases.^x If the catechumen were in danger of death during his probation, he was baptized without further delay.

With the system of preparatory training was introduced the practice of confining the ordinary administration of baptism to particular seasons. Easter and Whitsuntide were considered as especially suitable, on account of the connexion between the sacrament and the great events which those seasons respectively commemorated; and it was on the vigil of each festival that the chief performance of the baptismal rites took place.^y Yet baptism might still be given at other times: "Every day is the Lord's," says Tertullian, after stating the reasons for preferring Easter and Pentecost; "every hour, every time is fitting for baptism; if there be a difference as to solemnity, there is none as to grace."^z

Agreeably to apostolical practice, a profession of faith was exacted at baptism. Hence arose the use of *creeds*, embodying the essential points of belief, which were imparted to the catechumens in the last stage of their preparation.^a The name given to these forms—*Symbola*—seems either to have meant simply that they were tokens of Christian brotherhood, or to have been borrowed from the analogy of military service, in which the watchwords or passwords were so called.^b Renunciation of the devil and other spiritual enemies was also required;^c and it was probably in the second century that the rite of exorcising was introduced into the baptismal office^d—founded on the view that men were under the dominion of the evil one until set free by the reception of Christian grace.^e About the same time, probably, were added various symbolical ceremonies—the sign of the cross on the forehead; the kiss of peace, in token of admission into spiritual fellowship; white robes, figurative of the cleansing from sin; and the tasting of milk and honey, which were intended to typify the blessings of the heavenly Canaan.^f

Baptism was administered by immersion, except in cases of

note; Migne, Dict. des Conciles, i. 813.

^x Constit. Apostol. viii. 32; Bingham, X. i. 4; Neand. i. 322-3; Augusti, vi. 387; xi. 47.

^y Augusti, vii. 167, 170.

^z De Bapt. 19.

^a See Bingham, book x. c. 3; Augusti, vi. 411-3; Blunt, 21.

^b Mosheim, 320; Neander, i. 424-5.

^c Tertull. de Corona, 3.

^d Augusti (vii. 271) thinks that there are traces of baptismal exorcism in Tert. de Bapt. cc. 5, 20; but the first distinct mention of it is in one of St. Cyprian's Councils, A.D. 256. See the speeches of Cæcilius and Vincentius, Nos. 1 and 37. Neand. i. 428-9.

^e Ep. Barnab. 16; Giesel. I. i. 236.

^f Tert. de Cor. 3; Giesel. I. i. 236.

sickness, where affusion or sprinkling was used.^g St. Cyprian strongly asserts the sufficiency of this "clinical" baptism;^h but a stigma was justly attached to persons who put off their baptism until the supposed approach of death should enable them to secure the benefits of the sacrament without incurring its obligation to newness of life.ⁱ In opposition to this error, Tertullian, Origen, and Cyprian earnestly insist on the principle that right dispositions of mind are necessary in order to partake of the baptismal gifts, and warn against trusting to the virtue of an ordinance received in circumstances where it was hardly possible to conceive that such dispositions could exist.^k

That the baptism of infants was of apostolical origin there are abundant grounds of presumption.^m Thus, our Lord Himself, by receiving and blessing little children, showed that they are capable of spiritual benefits. His charge, to "make disciples of all nations, baptizing them," was given to persons who had been accustomed to the admission of infants into a spiritual covenant by the rite of circumcision, and even to the baptism of the children of proselytes. St. Paul seems to assumeⁿ that all who were capable of becoming members of the Jewish Church were equally admissible to the Christian Church; and we hear nothing of any dissensions on this point, whereas the exclusion of their infants would surely have been a grievance sufficient to provoke in the highest

^g Bingham, XI. xi. 4; Giesel. i. 382; Schaff, i. 564-6.

^h Ep. 69. ⁱ See p. 119, note t.

^k Tert. de Pœnit. 6; Orig. in Joann. tom. vi. 17; Cypr. Liber Testim. iii. 26; Neander, i. 350-1, 453; Kaye on Tertullian, 234. In connexion with such subjects, Neander and others often speak of "an *opus operatum*," so as to countenance the notion that by that term the Romanists understand a grace conferred by the external rite, irrespectively of the state of the receiver's heart. The idea attached to the words in the middle ages was indeed akin to this—viz. that (according to a supposition which seems to have then found supporters) the sacraments confer grace on such as do not by mortal sin put a bar to their efficacy, although there be no "*bonus motus interior*" in the receiver—thus apparently extending to sacraments generally a principle which the Anglican Church supposes applicable to the baptism of infants only. (See Scotus, quoted by Gieseler, II. ii. 457, and Biel, quoted by Hagenbach, ii. 81.) But the meaning in which the term has since been

adopted by the Romish Church is very different. The canon which sanctions it (Conc. Trident. Sess. vii. Can. 8) is directed against the doctrine that faith in the Divine promises supersedes the necessity of receiving the sacraments; and in opposition to this notion it teaches that grace is conferred by the sacraments, *ex opere operato*; i.e., that, while a preparation of heart (*opus operantis*) is necessary on the part of the receiver, there is also a grace in the sacraments themselves, which is bestowed through the administration on such as are qualified for receiving it. (See Perrone, Prælectiones, ii. 28-9, ed. Paris, 1842; Möhler, Symbolik, 255-7, ed. Mainz, 1843.) The 8th English Article of 1552 censures the term, but rather as being liable to misconstruction than as in itself wrong; so that the framers of the Article would seem to have admitted the Tridentine Canon (passed in 1547) as giving the true interpretation.

^m See Wall's Hist. of Infant Baptism; Augusti, iv. 111-3; vi. 40; Schaff, i. 566-576. ⁿ Rom. xi.

degree the characteristic jealousy of Jewish converts. We read of whole households baptized at once, without a hint that any members of them were excepted on account of tender age. And in St. Paul's charges as to the training of children, they seem to be regarded as already members of the Church; for otherwise we might certainly have expected to meet with directions for their instruction and discipline in preparation for baptism. The first distinct mention of infant-baptism is by St. Irenæus;^o but the whole bearing of early writings is in accordance with the judgment of Origen, who referred the practice to apostolical tradition.^p Tertullian, in terms hardly consistent with a belief in original sin (which, however, he elsewhere strongly declares),^q argues against hastening to administer baptism to "the age of innocence;"^r but his objection proves that the established usage was opposite, and he himself allows infants to be baptized when in danger of death.^s

Tertullian is a witness for the use of sponsors in baptism.^t

(3.) Confirmation, by imposition of hands and anointing with chrism, was originally given immediately after baptism;^x but in the second century the administration of it was ordinarily reserved to bishops, although in the east it was still sometimes performed by presbyters. When baptism was administered by a bishop or in his presence, as in cities at the great festivals, the supplementary rites were immediately added; in other cases, they were deferred until there should be an opportunity of receiving them at the hands of the bishop.^y Confirmation was bestowed on infants as well as on other baptized persons;^z and in some churches a practice of administering the Eucharist to infants and young children—founded on a belief that our Lord's words in St. John vi. 53, imposed an universal necessity of that sacrament in order to salvation—was established by the middle of the third century.^a

^o II. ii. 24. See Augusti, vii. 111.

^p In Rom. v. 9, p. 565. See Blunt on the Fathers, 548.

^q De Testim. Animæ, 3; de Anima, 16, 41. See Bp. Kaye on Tertullian, C. v. art. 9; Blunt on the Fathers, 192.

^r De Bapt. 18; see Pusey's note, Oxf. Transl. 277; Neand. i. 432-3; ii. 391; Kaye on Tertull. 311, 422-3; Blunt on the Fathers, 594.

^s See Cypr. Ep. 64; Wall, i. 97; Bingham, XI. iv. 10; Münter, Primordia Eccl. Afric. 102; Augusti, vii. 40-5; Giesel. I. i. 235.

^t De Bapt. 18.

^x Tertull. de Bapt. 8; Aug. vii. 407.

^y Conc. Elib. A.D. 305 (?) 77; Martene, i. 86; Bingham, XII. ii. 3.

^z Hieron. adv. Lucif. 9; Martene, i. 87; Augusti, vii. 412.

^a Cypr. de Lapsis, 25; Bingham, XII. i. 2-3; XV. iv. 7. Waterland, however, in his tract on Infant Communion, maintains "that they gave not the communion to mere infants, but to children, perhaps five, six, seven, or ten years old; and that under a notion of prudent caution, rather than of strict necessity, so far as appears." Works, vi. 65. See too Wall, ii. 478, seqq.

(4.) The elements of Christian worship appear, by the notices which occur in the New Testament, to have been the same from the earliest days, although varieties of detail and arrangement obtained in different churches.^b The ordinary service of "the day which is called *Sunday*," in the second century, is described by Justin Martyr.^c It began with passages from the Scriptures, read in a language which the hearers in general could understand; or, where no version as yet existed in a tongue intelligible to the common people, the selected passages were first read in Greek or Latin, and were then rendered into the local dialect by an interpreter.^d After this followed a discourse by the presiding ecclesiastic, which was usually directed to the application of the lessons which had been read. These addresses were at first simple and familiar in style, and hence received the name of *Homilies*, i. e. *Conversations*;^e but by degrees they rose into greater importance as a part of the service, and acquired something of a rhetorical character, which had originally been avoided for the sake of distinction from the harangues of secular orators and philosophers.^f

Psalmody formed a large portion of the early Christian worship. It consisted partly of the Old Testament psalms, and partly of hymns composed on Christian themes; and both in the Church and among heretical sects it was found a very effective means of impressing doctrine on the minds of the less educated members.^g

(5.) In the apostolic age the administration of the Eucharist took place in the evening, after the pattern of its original institution.^h The service included a thanksgiving by the bishop or presbyter for God's bounty in supplying the fruits of the earth, and, in acknowledgment of these gifts, the congregation presented offerings of bread and wine, from which the elements for consecration were taken. At the same time money was contributed for the relief of the poor, the maintenance of the clergy, and other ecclesiastical purposes.ⁱ The bread used in the administration

^b See Socrates, v. 22; Sozomen, vii. 19.

^c Apol. I. 67.

^d Bingham, XIII. iv. 6; Neander, i. 418-9; see Augusti, vol. vi.

^e Fleury, vi. 17; Augusti, vi. 253-4.

^f Neander, i. 420. Origen's homilies, which are the oldest extant compositions of the kind, were spoken extempore, and it was not until the age of sixty that he allowed them to be taken down

by stenographers. (Euseb. vi. 36.) See Augusti, vi. 268.

^g Neander, i. 420. See above, p. 34, as to Bardesanes; also Augusti, i. 275-7; v. 236, seqq. (who mentions two special treatises on the propagation of heresy by means of psalmody. i. 286-7.)

^h Martene, i. 107.

ⁱ Just. Mart. Apol. I. 65-7; Neander, i. 457.

was of the common sort, leavened;^k the wine was mixed with water,—at first merely in compliance with the ordinary custom of the East, although mystical reasons for the mixture were devised at least as early as the time of Clement of Alexandria, and an opinion of its necessity afterwards grew up.^l Before the consecration, the names of those who had offered, and of such saints or deceased members of the Church as were to be specially commemorated, were read from the *diptychs*; and, although the practice of reciting such lists was afterwards abandoned on account of their inconvenient length, it became usual to insert in the diptychs the names of the sovereign, of the patriarchs, and of neighbouring bishops, as a sign of Christian fellowship.^m

The Eucharist was at first preceded, but was afterwards more usually followed,ⁿ by the *Agape* or *Love-feast*. The materials of this were contributed by the members of the congregation, according to the means of each; all, of whatever station, sat down to it as equals, in token of their spiritual brotherhood; and the meal was concluded with psalmody and prayer. It was, however, too soon found (as even the Apostolic writings bear witness) that the ideal of this feast was liable to be grievously marred in practice. There was danger of excess and selfishness in partaking of it; for the richer Christians there was a temptation either to “shame”^o their poorer brethren, or, by a more subtle form of evil, to value themselves on their bounty and condescension towards them. It was found, too, that the secret celebration of such meals tended to excite the suspicions of the heathen; that it gave rise and countenance to the popular reports of Thyestean banquets, and other abominations. For such reasons the *Agape* was first disjoined from the Lord’s Supper, and then was abandoned.^p In the fourth century canons were directed against celebrations bearing this name, but which were altogether different from those to which it had been attached in earlier times.^q

After a time the administration of the Eucharist was transferred—and probably with a view of disarming the jealousies of the heathen^r—from the evening to the morning, when it was added to

^k See Augusti, iii. 267, seqq.

^l Clem. Alex. Pædag. ii. 2, p. 177; Cypr. Ep. 63; Bingham, XV. ii. 7; Augusti, viii. 294; Palmer, Origines Liturgicæ, ii. 75–6, ed. 2.

^m See Martene, i. 145–7; Ducange, s. v. *Diptycha*; Bingham, XV. iii. 17; Augusti, xii. 302–312; Giesel. 1. i. 378.

ⁿ See Bingham, XV. vii. 7–8; Augusti, i. 125; viii. 321.

^o 1 Cor. xi. 22; Clem. Alex. Pædag. ii. 1, p. 165.

^p Augusti, viii. 141; Neand. i. 450–2.

^q Bingham, XV. vii. 9. See below, Book ii. c. 6.

^r Augusti, viii. 141.

the service which had before been usual.^s Hence arose a distinction between the parts of the combined service. The earlier—the “mass of the catechumens”^t—was open to energumens (or possessed persons), to catechumens, penitents, and, in the fourth century, even to heretics, Jews, and heathens;^u while to the celebration of the holy mysteries—the “mass of the Faithful”—none were admitted but such as were baptized and in full communion with the Church. This division of the service must have been fully established before Tertullian’s time, since he attacks the Marcionites for their neglect of it.^x

In the very earliest times of the Church, the sacramental “breaking of bread” was daily; but the fervour of devotion in which such an observance was possible soon passed away, and the celebration was usually confined to the Lord’s Day. In Africa an idea of the necessity of daily communion (which was supposed to be indicated in the petition for “our daily bread”) led to a custom of carrying home portions of the consecrated bread, and eating a morsel of it every morning, before going forth to the business of the day. Thus the individual Christian was supposed to witness and maintain his union with his brethren elsewhere; and in this private use of one of the sacramental elements without the other appears to have originated one of the most inexcusable corruptions of the later Romish church.^y The Eucharist being regarded as the chief sign and bond of Christian communion, it was considered that all the members of the Church were bound to partake of it, except such as were debarred by ecclesiastical censures. All, therefore, who were present at the public administration communicated; and portions of the consecrated elements were reserved for the sick and for prisoners, to whom they were conveyed by the deacons after the public rites were ended.^z

(6.) While the idea of the Christian life regards all our time as holy to the Lord, it was yet felt to be necessary that human weakness should be guided and trained by the appointment of certain

^s Neander, i. 451. See Tertull. de Corona, 3; Cypr. Ep. lxiii. 15–6.

^t “Missa Catechumenorum.” The word *missa* (= *missio*) referred to the dismissal of the different classes at different parts of the service. Augusti, viii. 41; Gfrörer, ii. 787.

^u Gieseler, I. ii. 293–4. See can. 84 of the ivth Council of Carthage, A.D. 398.

^x Tertull. De Præscr. 41; Mosh. 520.

^y Tert. ad Uxor. ii. 5; Neander, i. 460–1; Guericke, i. 201. The practice of taking the eucharistic bread from the priest, without consuming it in church, was afterwards condemned. Conc. Cæsaraug. I. A.D. 380, c. 3; Conc. Tolet. I. A.D. 400, c. 14.

^z Just. Mart. Apol. I. 65–7; Augusti, viii. 224; Gieseler, I. i. 235.

days as more especially to be sanctified by religious solemnities.^a Hence, even from the very beginning of the Church, we find traces of a particular reverence attached to the first day of the week. The special consecration of one day in seven was recommended by the analogy of the ancient Sabbath; the first of the seven was that which the Christians selected, as commemorative of their Master's rising from the grave, with which a reference to the creation was combined.^b On this day the believers of the apostolic age met together; they celebrated it with prayer, psalmody, preaching, administration of the Lord's Supper, and collections for the needs of the Church; and according to their example the day was everywhere observed throughout the early centuries as one of holy joy and thanksgiving. All fasting on it was forbidden; the congregation stood at prayers, instead of kneeling, as on other days.^c The first evidence of a cessation from all worldly business on the Lord's day is found in Tertullian.^d

In memory of our Lord's betrayal and crucifixion, the fourth and sixth days of each week were kept as fasts, by abstinence from food until the hour at which He gave up the ghost—the ninth hour, or 3 P.M.^e In the manner of observing the seventh day, the eastern Church differed from the western. The orientals, influenced by the neighbourhood of the Jews, and by the ideas of Jewish converts, regarded it as a continuation of the Mosaic sabbath, and celebrated it almost in the same manner as the Lord's day; while their brethren of the west extended to it the fast of the preceding day.^f

Agreeably to the analogy of the elder Church, the first Christians assigned certain seasons to an annual remembrance of the great events in the history of redemption. Of these seasons the chief was the *Pascha*, which included both the Crucifixion and the Resurrection.^g The festival of the Resurrection was preceded by a solemn fast, as to the length of which the practice varied. Irenæus states that some were in the habit of keeping one day, some two

^a Clem. Alex. Strom. vii. 7, pp. 851, 854; Orig. c. Cels. viii. 22–3.

^b Just. Mart. Apol. I. 67.

^c Tert. de Corona, 3; Bingham, XX. ii. 5–6. See Dr. Pusey's note, pp. 417, seqq. in the Oxford translation of St. Ephrem.

^d De Oratione, c. 23; Neander, i. 409.

^e Bingham, XXI. iii. 2–3.

^f Socr. v. 22; Sozom. vii. 19; Bingham, XX. iii. 1–6. Tertullian before becoming a Montanist took the western

view (De Orat. 23); afterwards the eastern (De Jejun. 14). See Kaye on Tertull. 389; Neander, i. 410.

^g Bingham, XXI. i. 31; Augusti, i. 139; Neander, i. 415. The most plausible of the etymologies proposed for the German *Ostern* and English *Easter* appear to be (1) from the old Teutonic *wstan* (to rise up); (2) from the name of a Saxon goddess, whose festival fell about the same season. See Augusti, ii. 222.

days, and some forty; but whether the forty ought to be understood as signifying days or hours is disputed.^h In any case, the observance of the fast was as yet voluntary, except on the day of the Crucifixion.¹

The whole *Pentecostal* season—from Easter to Whitsuntide—was regarded as festival; as on Sundays, the people prayed standing, and all fasting was forbidden.^k Whitsun-day itself was observed with especial solemnity; and in the course of the third century Ascension-day began to be also distinguished above the rest of the season.¹

It would seem that at Rome the Saviour's birth was celebrated on the 25th of December;^m that the Eastern Church (like the Basilidians)ⁿ kept the 6th of January in memory of the *Epiphany*—by which name was understood his manifestation as the Messiah at his baptism; and that when, in course of time, the commemoration of the nativity made its way into some parts of the east, it, also, was observed on the same day—St. Luke iii. 23 being supposed to intimate that the baptism took place on the anniversary of the birth. The adoption of the Epiphany in the west (where a reference to other events in the Gospel history was joined with, and at length supplanted, the subject of the old oriental festival), and the separate celebration of Christmas-day in the east, belong to the fourth century.^o

The memory of martyrs was very early honoured by religious commemorations, as appears from the letter written in the name of the church of Smyrna on the death of St. Polycarp.^p On the anniversary of a martyr's suffering (which was styled his *natalitia*, or birthday, as being the day of his entrance on a better life) there was a meeting at the place of his burial—often a subterranean catacomb or crypt;^q the acts of his passion were read, and the

^h Fragm. ap. Euseb. v. 24. It is chiefly a question of punctuation. Noël Alexandre (v. Dissert. 4), Massuet, and Stieren (i. 824) are for understanding forty days. See Thorndike, i. 283-5; Heinichen, Exc. VII. in Euseb. (t. iii. 379); Augusti, x. 395.

ⁱ Iren. ap. Euseb. v. 24; Tert. de Orat. 18; Augusti, i. 157. See for the Lent fast Bp. Gunning's work on the subject; Bingham, XXI. i. 2-3; Planck, i. 462; Gieseler, I. i. 240; Socrates, v. 22; Sozomen, vii. 19.

^k Iren. Fragm. t. i. 828; Tertull. de Cor. 3; de Jejun. 14; Cassian, Collat. xxi. 11, 20; Bingham, XIII. viii. 3; XX. vi. 1-3.

¹ Bingham, XX. vi. 5; Neander, i.

416. The earliest mention is in the Apostolical Constitutions (v. 19; viii. 33). Augusti thinks that the observance cannot be proved older than the fourth century, ii. 351-4.

^m Augusti thinks that this was not before the fourth century, i. 213, seqq.

ⁿ See p. 50.

^o Bingham, XX. iv. 2-6; Mosheim, i. 372; Schröckh, x. 352-6; Neander, i. 417-8; iii. 435-440; Giesel. I. i. 376; ii. 288. Augusti, however, seems to think that the manifestation to the Gentiles was the *original* subject of the Epiphany. i. 152-4; 330-2.

^p Cc. 17, 19; Giesel. I. i. 246-7.

^q Bingham, XX. vii. 8; Giesel. I. i. 377.

brethren were exhorted to imitate his virtues; prayer was made; the eucharist was celebrated, with an especial offering of thanks for the martyr;^r and sometimes the Agape followed.^s But, although a belief early crept in that the intercession of martyrs had somewhat of a like power for opening the kingdom of heaven to that which was allowed them in restoring penitents to the communion of the earthly Church,^t while it was supposed to obtain both forgiveness and grace for their brethren who were yet in the flesh—although Origen even ascribes to the deaths of martyrs an atoning effect akin to that of the Redeemer's sacrifice^u—their interest was bespoken only by entreaties *before* their suffering; they, like the rest of the faithful departed, were supposed to have not as yet entered on the perfect blessedness of heaven; nor is there in the worship of the early Christians any evidence of prayer either to them or through them after death.^x

It does not appear that festivals were as yet assigned to the Apostles, except in those churches with which they had been more especially connected.^y

A service in remembrance of departed relatives was usual on the anniversaries of their deaths. The surviving kindred met at the grave; the eucharist was celebrated; an oblation for the deceased was laid on the altar with those of the living; and his name was mentioned in prayer, with a commendation to eternal peace.^z

(7.) The commission of grievous error in life or doctrine was punished by exclusion from the communion of the Church; and, in order to obtain re-admission, offenders were obliged to submit to a prescribed course of penance. The regulations as to the length and manner of this penance varied in different times, and in the several branches of the Church;^a the administration of it was chiefly in the hands of the bishops, who were at liberty to exercise their discretion in each case, on a consideration not only of the penitent's demeanour under the discipline, but of his entire history and character.^b Reconciliation after the heaviest sins, such as murder, adultery, and idolatry, was allowed only once to the baptized. In some cases, the whole life was to be a period of penance;

^r Bingham, XX. vii. 8.

^s Bingham, XX. vii. 10; Giesel. I. i. 379–81. It is related of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus that he introduced commemorations of martyrs into his church with a view of making up to his converts for the loss of the pagan festivals. Greg. Nyss. Vita S. Greg. Thaum. Opera, ii. 1007.

^t Augusti, ix. 97.

^u See p. 110.

^x Schröckh, ix. 163–6; Neander, i. 463–4. See Jacobson, PP. Apost. 586.

^y Bingham, XX. vii. 11.

^z Neand. i. 462–3.

^a Martene, i. 266, seqq.; Giesel. I. i. 387–390.

^b Conc. Ancyr. A.D. 314, c. 5; Augusti, ix. 77.

in some, reconciliation was not granted even in the hour of death,^c although the refusal was not meant to imply that the sinner was shut out from the Divine forgiveness.^d The Church's office was not supposed in these ages to extend beyond prescribing the means which might best dispose the sinner's mind for seeking the mercy of God; Cyprian, Firmilian, and other teachers are careful to guard against the danger of imagining that ecclesiastical absolution could forestall the sentence of the last day.^e The dissensions which took place at Rome and at Carthage in consequence of the persecution under Decius afford abundant evidence of the popular tendency to error in connexion with this subject.^f The difficulties then felt in treating the cases of the lapsed led to the establishment in some churches of *penitentiary* priests, whose business it was to hear privately the confessions of offenders, and to direct them in the conduct of their repentance.^g And towards the end of the third century, the system was further organized by a division of the penitents into four classes, each of which marked a particular stage in the course, and had a special place assigned to its members in the time of divine service.^h

(8.) The churches of the early Christians had no images or pictures;ⁱ for the connexion of art with heathen religion and with the moral impurities of heathenism was regarded as a reason against the employment of it in sacred things.^k It was through the usages of common life that art gradually found its way into the Church. Instead of the figures or emblems of gods with which the heathen adorned their houses, their furniture, their cups, and their signets, the Christians substituted figurative representations, such as a shepherd carrying a lamb on his shoulders, emblematic of Christ the "Good Shepherd;"^l a dove, the symbol of the Holy Ghost; a ship, significant of the Church, the ark of salvation, sailing towards heaven;^m a fish, which, by its connexion with water, conveyed an allusion to baptism, while the letters which

^c e.g. Conc. Eliber. A.D. 305 (?), cc. 1, 2, 7, 8, &c. See Nat. Alex. vi. 165, seqq.

^d Bingham, XVIII. iii. 3; iv. 1-2; Giesel. I. i. 240-4, 386; Kaye on Tertullian, 238.

^e Firmil. ad Cypr. (Cypr. Ep. 75), § 4; Cyp. Ep. lv. 18; de Lapsis, 17; Neander. i. 305-6; Giesel. I. i. 383-4.

^f See above, pp 116-121.

^g Socrates, v. 19; Sozom. vii. 16; Augusti, ix. 161.

^h The four were (1) *flentes*, (2) *audientes*, (3) *gemeflectentes* or *substrati*, and (4) *consistentes*; i.e. weepers, hearers,

kneelers, and standers. Bingham, XVIII. i. 3; Augusti, ix. 71; Giesel. I. i. 385.

ⁱ Origen says that the use of images is of the Ophites. C. Cels. vii. 4.

^k Minuc. Fel. 10, 32; Neander, i. 403-4; Pusey on Tertullian, 109; Piper, Mythologie u. Symbolik d. Christl. Kunst, Weimar, 1847, i. 2; Kugler's Schools of Painting in Italy, ed. Eastlake, Lond. 1851, p. 2; Blunt on the Fathers, 53-5.

^l Lord Lindsay on Christian Art, i. 40-1. See Tertull. de Pudic. 7, 10.

^m Lindsay, i. 18.

formed its Greek name might be interpreted as designating the Saviour;^a a lyre or an anchor, the types of Christian joy and hope.^o And in this system were introduced even such heathen emblems as could be privately understood in a Christian sense—for example, the vine of Bacchus. In like manner the Saviour was represented as Orpheus, Apollo, or (in his character of the Good Shepherd) as Mercury; and Theseus slaying the Minotaur typified the victory of David over Goliath.^p But as yet no other than symbolical figures were used. Neither art nor tradition professed to convey an idea of the Saviour's human form, while, on the supposed authority of some prophetic texts,^q it was generally believed to have been mean beyond that of mankind in general;^r the earliest imaginary representations of Him are met with, not among orthodox Christians, but among the Carpocratian heretics and in the eclectic heathenism of Alexander Severus.^s Towards the end of the period, however, we find among the canons of the Council of Eliberis one which forbids paintings in churches, "lest," it is said, "that which is worshipped and adored be painted on the walls."^t Such an enactment is evidence at once of a recent and growing practice, and of the light in which it was regarded by the simple and austere mind of the Spanish Church.

The figure of the cross (with which, as Tertullian witnesses,^u it was the custom of the early Christians to sign their foreheads very frequently in the occasions of their daily life) was early introduced into churches. It had not, however, during this period assumed its place over the altar, nor was any devotion paid to it.^v

IV. *Moral Character of Christians—Asceticism—Celibacy.*

As the Christians of the early centuries embraced the Gospel at the risk of much worldly sacrifice and suffering, we naturally expect to find that their lives were generally marked by a serious endeavour to realise their holy calling. And thus on the whole it was,

^a The word *ἰχθύς* (fish) being made up of the first letters of *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, Θεοῦ Υἱός, Σωτήρ* (Jesus Christ, Son of God, Saviour). (Optatus, iii. 2.) See two dissertations, by Dom Pitra and the Cavaliere Rossi, in vol. iii. of the *Spicilegium Solesmense*.

^o Clem. Alex. *Pæd.* iii. 11, p. 289.

^p Hope on Architecture, 167; Piper, *Mythologie u. Symbolik der Christl. Kunst*, i. 39, 67, 75, 77, 136.

^q Isaiah, lii. 14; liii. 2.

^r Just. Dial. c. Tryph. 14, 88; Clem. Strom. iii. 17, p. 559; vi. 17, p. 818; Tert. de Carne Christi, 9; Pusey on

Tertullian, 252.

^s Sup. p. 95; Iren. I. xxv. 6; Neand. i. 404-5; Giesel. I. i. 85, 375. Milman, iii. 502-8; Kugler, 3-11.

^t Can. 36. See Nat. Alex. vi. 332, seqq.; Schröckh, v. 64; Neand. i. 405-6; and Giesel. I. i. 375, who says that the evasions by which Baronius and others attempted to avoid the force of this canon are now abandoned by Romanists.

^u De Corona, 3.

^v Bingham, VIII. i. 20; Neand. i. 406; Giesel. I. i. 236; De Caumont, *Abécédaire*, i. 142.

although the condition of the Church from the very beginning bore witness to the truth of those prophetic parables which had represented it as containing a mixture of evil members with the good. The Apologists, while they acknowledge many defects among their brethren, are yet always able to point to the contrast between the lives of Christians and the utter degradation of heathen morals as an evidence of the power of the Gospel.^x No stronger proof of this contrast need be sought than the fact that the philosophers who undertook to reinvigorate the heathen system with a view of meeting the aggressions of the new religion, found a moral reformation no less necessary than a reform of the current doctrines of heathenism.^y

The mutual love of Christians—a love which in its disinterested sympathy for all men was something wholly new to the heathen^z—was that which most impressed those who viewed the Church from without.^a Their care of the poor, the aged, the widows, and the orphans of the community—their reverential ministrations to the brethren who were imprisoned for the faith—their kindness to slaves, whom the maxims of the ancient world had regarded as mere animated tools,^b whereas the Gospel, while it did not interfere with the difference of social position, yet raised the slave to the footing of spiritual brotherhood with his master, and reminded the master that he too was the redeemed servant of Christ—the liberal gifts sent from one country to another for the relief of distress—the contributions raised in order to the deliverance of captives—the system of letters of communion,^c which not only procured for Christians admission to spiritual privileges in every church which they might visit, but entitled them to the charity and good offices of its members—such were some of the tokens in which the spirit of love was conspicuously shown; and while the sight of these things had its due effect on many as a witness for the faith which could produce such fruits, it probably became one means of attracting unworthy converts from the needy classes, through the hope of sharing in the bounty of the richer brethren.^d

The force of Christian principle shone forth with especial lustre in seasons of general calamity. The charitable labours of Cyprian and his flock on occasion of the plague in the reign of Gallus

^x *e.g.* Ep. ad Diognet. 5; Orig. c. Cels. iii. 30; vii. 48–9. See Blunt, c. vi.

^y Neand. i. 348.

^z A. de Broglie, i. 160.

^a This even became a subject of ridicule; thus the heathen in Minucius Felix says, “*amant mutuo pæne antequam noverint,*” etc. (c. 9). Comp.

Tertull. Apol. c. 39.

^b Aristot. Eth. Nicom. viii. 11.

^c “*Litteræ formatæ.*” Planck, i. 104–7; Neand. i. 286; 353–5; Giesel, I. i. 41–4.

^d Neand. i. 348–9. Against Gibbon’s exaggerations as to this, see Blunt on the Fathers, Ser. ii, Lect. 3.

have been already mentioned.^e A like course was taken at the same time by Dionysius and the Church of Alexandria; and, as we have lately seen, the Christian spirit was again nobly manifested by the Alexandrians during the famine and pestilence under Maximin.^f

It was felt that in their ordinary life Christians ought to be marked as distinct from heathens. Certain occupations were altogether forbidden—as those of actors, diviners, charioteers, and makers of images.^g A convert who had followed any such calling was required to forsake it before admission to baptism; and, until he could find some other means of supporting himself, he was maintained from the funds of the Church.^h St. Cyprian strongly condemns a Christian, who, having been formerly a player, endeavoured to earn a livelihood by giving lessons in his old profession.ⁱ Attendance at theatres was forbidden, not only on account of the original connexion between the drama and heathen religion, or of the frequent offences against decency and morality which occurred in the performances of the stage, but also because the waste of time on such frivolous amusements was considered to be inconsistent with the spiritual life.^k Stories are told of judgments on persons who had ventured to disregard the rule; thus Tertullian relates that a woman who went to a theatre returned home possessed by a devil; and that the evil spirit, on being reproached by the exorcist for assaulting one of the faithful, answered that he had a right to do so, inasmuch as he had found her on his own ground.^l The games of the circus, the gladiatorial shows, and the combats of wild beasts, were interdicted in like manner. Some Christians, as we learn from Tertullian, attempted to argue that such prohibitions were not warranted by Scripture; but the great African vehemently denounces the interested casuistry which sought to relax the severity of the Church's laws.^m

The sense of the obligation to be unlike the heathen, while it acted as a safeguard to the virtue of many Christians, was yet not

^e P. 121.

^f P. 149.

^g *c. g.* Const. Apost. viii. 32; Conc. Elib. A.D. 305 (?), c. 62; Augusti, vii. 130.

^h Neand. i. 363-4.

ⁱ Ep. 2; Neand. i. 369-371. It is said that a player named Gelasinus, having on a white dress, was thrown by his fellows into a bath, in mockery of baptism, and that on coming out he declared himself to have been converted to Christianity by a vision which he

had seen at the moment of his immersion. He refused to appear again on the stage, and was stoned to death by the multitude in consequence. Chron. Paschal. A.D. 297.

^k Neand. i. 365-7.

^l "In meo eam inveni." De Spectac. 26. Against theatrical amusements in the latter part of the 5th century see Salvian. de Gub. Dei, vi. 3.

^m De Spectac. 3, seqq.

without danger in other respects. It sometimes became a temptation to a narrow and self-satisfied spirit; it incited to a needless and offensive display of differences; it tended to an over-valuation of mere outward distinctions and acts, in respect both of their necessity and of their importance.ⁿ Hence arose the extreme reverence for confessorship and martyrdom, without sufficient regard to the character and motives of the sufferers.^o Hence, too, came the system of professing an extraordinary austerity, and a renunciation of things which were allowed to be lawful for the mass of believers. Such renunciation had been practised both among Jews and among heathens;^p and as early, at least, as the beginning of the second century, there were some Christian ascetics who bound themselves to an especial strictness of living, but without any perpetual or irrevocable vows.^q That the Church, however, was not at that time disposed to attach an undue value to such exercises, may be inferred from the statement, that when one of the Lyonnese martyrs, Alcibiades, attempted to continue in prison his custom of living on bread and water only, his fellow-prisoner Attalus was charged in a vision to warn him against refusing God's creatures and risking offence to his brethren; and that thereupon Alcibiades conformed to the usual diet.^r The ascetic life was more fully systematised when the influence of Platonism grew on the Church—bringing with it the idea, common in oriental religions, of attaining to a likeness of the Divine repose by a lofty abstraction from mundane things.^s While ordinary believers were allowed to follow the usual business of the world, the higher spirits were to devote themselves to prayer and meditation; and in the countries where this division was first recognised, the influence of climate powerfully conduced to a preference of the contemplative over the active life.^t

In the course of the second century societies had been formed for the purpose of living together under a religious rule.^u Some, considering even such society to be too distracting, shut themselves up in utter seclusion; and in the third century these *eremites*,^x or

ⁿ Neand. i. 359–360.

^o Giesel. I. i. 244; 410–1; Kaye on Tertullian, 132.

^p Eusebius (ii. 17) and Sozomen (i. 13) conjecture that Philo (De Vita Contemplat. Opera, ii. 471, seqq., ed. Mangey), in describing the Therapeutæ of Egypt, who lived by a sort of monastic rule, had in view a society of Christians; but the opinion is now generally abandoned.

^q Mosh. 310–1; Giesel. I. i. 402. Theiner, i. 47. The title of ascetics (*ἀσκηται*) was borrowed from a similar class among the heathen Greeks. Mosh. 314–5; Neand. i. 380–3.

^r Euseb. v. 3.

^s Mosh. 310; Kaye on Tertullian, 400–2; Theiner, i. 12.

^t Mosh. 316–9; Giesel. I. i. 403.

^u Mosh. 609; Gfrörer, i. 449.

^x From *ἐρημος*, desert.

hermits, retired further from the haunts of men, to bury themselves in the wildest and most inaccessible solitudes. Paul of Alexandria has been mentioned as having withdrawn into the wilderness from the Decian persecution.^y Antony, the most celebrated of the hermits, although his earlier history falls within this period, may more fitly be noticed in a future chapter.

The state of celibacy was, from the first, regarded as higher than that of matrimony; nor is it easy to distinguish in how far the commendations of single life were founded on its advantages in times of distress, or on its exemption from the dangers of heathen connexion, and in how far they implied a belief in an essential superiority.^z When, however, this superiority was exaggerated by sectaries, so as to disparage the holiness of marriage, the members of the Church earnestly combated such opinions.^a It was found, too, that a profession of celibacy was not always enough to give security against the temptations of this world. Thus Tertullian, in his Montanistic days, threw out serious imputations against the character and motives of some who had been enrolled among the virgins of the African Church;^b and Cyprian found himself obliged to write against the vanities of dress and demeanour in which the virgins of the same Church in his time indulged.^c Moreover, when the lawful intercourse of the sexes was forbidden or renounced, grievous scandals sometimes arose in its place.^d

The single life came, by degrees, to be considered especially suitable for the clergy,^e but no constraint was as yet put on them, although a progress of restriction may be observed during the period. Thus, whereas it appears, from Tertullian's invectives, that even second marriages were freely contracted by the clergy of his day,^f we find the Council of Eliberis, a century later, enacting that bishops, priests, deacons, and even the inferior clergy, should live with their wives as if unmarried.^g The severity of this

^y P. 97.

^z See Blunt on the Fathers, 243-9.

^a *e.g.* Clem. Alex. Strom. iii. 6; Aug. c. Faust. xxx. 6. See Mosh. 312; Theiner, i. 58; Neand. i. 389.

^b De Veland. Virg. 14.

^c De Habitu Virginum."

^d See Cyprian, Ep. 4, as to the cohabitation of clergymen with the virgins of the Church. Theiner, i. 89-92; Neand. i. 384; Giesel. I. i. 406; Newman in St. Athanasius, Tracts, 241.

^e Theiner, i. 71-3.

^f He speaks of this indeed, not only

as contrary to Scripture and apostolical discipline, but as a decline from the system which he himself remembered—"Usque adeo quosdam memini digamos loco dejectos." (De Exhort. Castit. c. 7. See Kaye's Tertull. 210; Giesel. I. i. 238.) But perhaps we need not infer much as to earlier practice from the assertions of so passionate a writer.

^g "Placuit in totum prohiberi episcopis, presbyteris, et diaconibus, vel omnibus clericis *positis in ministerio*, abstinere se a conjugibus suis," etc. C. 33. Schröckh (v. 63-4) infers from the words

rule was, however, beyond the general notions of the age. Other canons, about the same date, forbid the marriage of the higher clergy, but do not interfere with the conjugal relations of such as had been married before their ordination to the diaconate.^h

The recognition of a distinction between a higher and a lower Christian life was dangerous, not only because it tended to encourage the mass of men in laxity,—so that the teachers of the Church had often to combat excuses for careless living which rested on such grounds,—but also as laying a temptation to pride and self-sufficiency in the way of those who embraced the more exalted profession.ⁱ Yet both in this and in many other respects, although we may see in the first three centuries the germ of errors and mischiefs which afterwards became unhappily prevalent, their appearance is as yet only in the germ. Hence we may, at the same time, detect the evil which lurks in ideas and practices of those early days, and yet duly reverence the holy men who originated or advanced such ideas or practices, without any suspicion of the evil which was in them. An understanding Christian must never forget that, in the experience of the ages which have since passed, Providence has supplied him with instruction and warning which were not bestowed on the Primitive Church. He must remember that, for the formation of his own opinions, and for the guidance of his own conduct, he is bound to consider the proved results of things which at first were introduced as conducive to the further advancement of piety. While it is his duty to resist every feeling which would lead him to exalt himself above earlier and more simple times, he must yet, with a due sense of responsibility for the use of the means of judgment which have been vouchsafed to him, endeavour, by the lights of Scripture and history, to discriminate, not only between absolute truth and fully-developed falsehood, but between wholesome and dangerous tendencies, and to ascertain the boundaries at which lawful progress ends and corruption begins.

in italics that the canon applied only to the times when the clergy should be specially on duty. Gieseler (I. i. 405) supposes this to be the meaning as to the lower clergy, but that the prohibition for the higher orders is total. See Theiner, i. 79–80.

^h Giesel. i. 405. The 10th Canon of the Council of Ancyra, A.D. 314, enacts

that persons who at their ordination as deacons signify an intention of marrying shall be allowed to do so; but that such as marry without having thus reserved the right, shall be suspended. The 5th apostolical canon forbids bishops, priests, or deacons to cast out their wives under pretext of religion.

ⁱ Neand. i. 386–7; Giesel. I. i. 410.

BOOK II.

FROM CONSTANTINE TO GREGORY THE GREAT, A.D. 313-590.

CHAPTER I.

CONSTANTINE—DONATISM—ARIANISM.

A.D. 313-337.

I. THE idea that the Emperors of Rome might be Christians had been regarded by Tertullian as one which involved inconsistency and impossibility ;^a but it was now to be realized.

Constantine had probably been trained in the religion of his father, which appears to have been an eclectic system, founded on the belief in one Supreme God.^b Some years of his youth were spent at the court of Diocletian and Galerius in the character of a hostage ;^c and while thus detained he had opportunities of observing the deceits by which the pagan priesthood endeavoured to influence the emperor's mind ;^d he witnessed the publication of the persecuting edict at Nicomedia, and the horrors which followed.^e When hailed by the legions in Britain as his father's successor, A.D. 306. he continued and extended the toleration which Constan- Ætat. 32.

of belief tius had bestowed on the Christians :^f but it would seem that in this he was rather influenced by indifference and by political considerations than by any inclination to embrace their religion. Whatever his secret belief may have been, he continued to share in all the public rites of paganism, and professed to regard Apollo as his especial patron.^g

^a After saying that Pilate was "jam pro suâ conscientiâ Christianus," and reported our Lord's history to Tiberius, he continues, "Sed et Cæsares credidissent, si aut Cæsares non essent sæculo necessarii, aut si et Christiani potuissent esse Cæsares." *Apol.* 21.

^b Schröckh, v. 63 ; Beugnot, i. 55.

^c *Eus. de Vita Const.* 19 ; *De Mort. Persec.* 19, 24, and notes *Patrol.* vii. 338, 507.

^d See p. 144, n. ^a.

^e *Const. Oratio ad sanctum cœtum*, c. 25, appended to *Life* by Eusebius.

^f *De Mort. Persec.* 24.

^g Eumenius, *Panegy. ad Const.* c. 21 (*Patrol.* viii. 638) ; *Tillem. Emp.* iv. 125-6 ; *Mosh.* 953-4. Apollo was, however, considered to be a pagan representative of the Saviour, so that the worship paid to him might be interpreted in an esoteric sense, or his service might be a preparation for the reception of the Gospel. Gieseler, I. i. 270.

The most critical event in Constantine's religious history took place in the year 312, as he was on his march against Maxentius. Eusebius^h tells us that, as the tyrant was known to be preparing for the struggle by magical and superstitious rites, Constantine felt the need of supernatural aid in order to cope with him, and therefore considered to what god he should betake himself; that, remembering how his father had always been blessed with prosperity, whereas the persecutors of Christianity had come to miserable ends, he resolved to forsake the service of idols, and prayed to the god of Constantius—the one Supreme Being; and that, as he was engaged in such thoughts, he saw in the sky, soon after mid-day,ⁱ a luminous cross, with the words, “By this conquer.” While perplexed by the vision the emperor fell asleep; when the Saviour appeared to him, bearing in his hand the same symbol which had been displayed in the heavens, commanding him to use it as his standard in war, and giving him the assurance of victory. On awaking, Constantine described the ensign which had been shown to him in his dream, and from that time his troops marched under the protection of the *Labarum*—a banner on which the cross was combined with the first letters of the Redeemer's name.^k The emperor then sought, and received from the Christian clergy, instruction as to the meaning of the vision which had been vouchsafed to him; and, after his victory at the Milvian Bridge, he erected at Rome a statue of himself, holding in its right hand a cross, while the inscription ascribed his victory to the power of that “saving sign.”^l

The story of a vision or dream in which the cross was displayed to Constantine, with a charge that he should use it as a device, and with a promise of victory, is also related by other ecclesiastical writers, but with variations which, while they add to the presumption that it had some foundation in truth, increase the difficulties of the account which Eusebius professes to have received, under the sanction of an oath, from the emperor himself shortly before his death.^m The literal accuracy of these narratives will now find

^h De Vita Const. i. 27–32. Comp. De Mort. Persec. 44; Socrates, i. 2; Sozomen, i. 3.

ⁱ See Heinichen on Euseb. de Vita Const. pp. 523–4. The scene of the vision is placed by some writers in Gaul (Tillem. Emp. iv. 128, 632); by others, near Rome. (Milman, ii. 351.)

^k On the *Labarum*, see Augusti, xii. 109–115. Some suppose it to have been older than Constantine. The etymology of the name has been much disputed,

without any satisfactory result. The standard was guarded by fifty chosen men, whom it was supposed to render invulnerable. Euseb. de V. C. ii. 7–9; Sozom. i. 3; Gibbon, ii. 154.

^l Euseb. Hist. Eccl. ix. 9; V. C. i. 40. Gibbon (ii. 154) and Heinichen (in V. C.) think it more likely that the statue was erected during a later visit of the emperor to Rome.

^m See Gibbon, ii. 154; Schröckh, v. 72, seqq.; Murdock, n. on Mosheim, i. 290.

few defenders.ⁿ Educated as Constantine had been, and after the experience through which he had passed, it is extremely improbable that he could have been so utterly unacquainted with everything relating to Christianity as the historians here represent him. Perhaps we may fairly suppose that he had been accustomed to regard the Christian God as one of many—as standing on a level with the host of pagan deities; that the circumstances of his opposition to Maxentius may have turned his thoughts towards this God, and that he may have been on the outlook for some omen of the future; that he may have seen a remarkable appearance in the air, which to his excited imagination bore the form of the Christian symbol,^o while, although his army witnessed the same sight, it had not for them the shape or the meaning with which the emperor's fancy invested it;^p that the motto (if not to be explained in the same manner as the cross itself) may possibly have been nothing more than the *inference* drawn from the phenomenon; that the dream was a continuation of the thoughts in which the mind had before been engaged. And, if it be assumed that Eusebius reported his hero's relation with perfect accuracy, it is surely not unwarrantable to suppose that the other circumstances may have grown up within the emperor's mind in the course of years, as his adhesion to the Christian faith became more entire, and his continued prosperity confirmed him in the belief that he was an especial favourite of Heaven—a belief which is strongly marked throughout his career.^q

The benefit conferred on the Christians by the edicts of 312 and 313 was toleration, not ascendancy over other religions;^r and if we attempt to discover the progress of Constantine's own opinions by his acts and legislation,^s we find much that is doubtful and perplexing in the history of his next years. He spoke of "the Divinity" in vague and ambiguous terms.^t He omitted the secular

ⁿ See, however, Newman on Ecclesiastical Miracles, 133-143.

^o Ominous appearances in the sky are related both by Christian and by pagan writers of that age—among them, another vision of the cross, seen in 351 at Jerusalem, and in the same hour at Mursa, where the army of Constantius was engaged with that of Magnentius. (Chron. Paschal. A.D. 351.) St. Cyril of Jerusalem, who attests this appearance (Ep. ad Const. p. 247, ed. Prevôt, Paris, 1640), although he mentions the discovery of the cross in Constantine's reign, says nothing of that emperor's vision. Comp. Sozom. iv. 5; Philostorg. iii. 26; and for

later instances see Gieseler, I. i. 271.

^p Thus we may understand how (as is stated) *all* saw it, and yet it was not generally known when Constantine long after related the story to Eusebius.

^q See Mosheim, 971-7, 980-6; Gibbon, ii. 158-9, and Milman's notes; Schröckh, v. 63-89; Augusti, xii. 106-8; Heinichen on Euseb. de V. C., 522-3; Neander, iii. 10-16; Gieseler, I. i. 271; Beugnot, i. 66; Milman, ii. 349-353; Broglie, i. 218, and Append. C.

^r Mosh. 964, 973-4; Milm. ii. 357.

^s His laws are arranged chronologically in the Latin Patrologia, vol. viii.

^t Beugnot, i. 78.

games, which, in the ordinary course, would have been celebrated in 314, and, to the great indignation of the Romans, he refused to take part in the rites of Jupiter Capitolinus.^u He favoured the Christians in many ways; he bestowed munificent gifts on the community, and built churches; he committed the education of his son Crispus to the celebrated Christian rhetorician, Lactantius;^x he associated much with bishops, frequently making them the companions of his table and of his journeys; he interfered in the settlement of religious disputes.^y In 313 he exempted the *Catholic* clergy from the decurionate^z—an office which, from having once been an object of ambition, had come to be generally regarded as an oppressive burthen, on account of the expense, the labour, and the unpopular functions connected with it.^a As it was found that in consequence of this law, many persons, whose property rendered them eligible as decurions,^b pressed into the minor orders of the Church for the purpose of obtaining an exemption, Constantine afterwards ordered that no person qualified for the decurionate should be admitted to ordination; that the clergy should be chosen from the poorer members of the Church; and that only so many should be ordained as were necessary to fill up vacant places.^c But when some cities attempted to reclaim those who had become clerks with the object of evading civil office, the emperor forbade that such persons as were already ordained should be molested.^d

It would appear that in 315 Constantine exempted the lands of ecclesiastics from the ordinary taxes—an exemption which was afterwards withdrawn.^e In the same year he abolished crucifixion as a punishment,^f and decreed that any Jews who should attempt to raise a tumult against Christians should be burnt.^g In 316 he allowed that the emancipation of slaves, which had until then been performed before a magistrate, might also take place in churches; and, in order to give popularity to the new method, it was divested of many troublesome formalities with which the act of emancipation had formerly been encumbered.^h By two laws of the year 319 he forbade private sacrifices and divination, and ordered

^u Ibid. 74–5.

^x Hieron. de VV. Illustr. 80.

^y Euseb. V. C. i. 42–4; Heinichen in Euseb. 509–510.

^z Euseb. H. Eccl. x. 7. Cf. Cod. Theod. XVI. ii. 1; v. 1 (A.D. 326).

^a See the laws against exemptions and evasions, Cod. Theod. XII. tit. i.; Cod. Just. X. xxxi. seqq.; also Gibbon, ii. 49–50; and the account of the duties in Guizot, 'Civilization in France,' Lect. 2.

^b The qualification was the possession of 25 acres of land. Guizot, i. 305.

^c Cod. Theod. XVI. ii. 3 (A.D. 320); ib. 6 (A.D. 326). The first constitution to this effect is lost.

^d Patrol. viii. 200.

^e Cod. Theod. XI. i. 1; Gieseler, I. ii. 164. The measure has been by some referred to Constantius. The last editor of the Code, Haenel, dates it in 313. Patrol. viii. 100.

^f Aurel. Victor, 41; Sozom. i. 8.

^g Cod. Theod. XVI. viii. 1.

^h Soz. i. 9. See Cod. Theod. IV. vii. 1, and notes; Schröckh, v. 93.

that priests or diviners should not enter dwelling-houses for the exercise of their art, on pain of being burnt. But by the same laws the public exercise of such rites was still permitted;ⁱ and two years later, while the practice of magic with any hurtful object was severely denounced, the emperor sanctioned the use of magical means for bodily cures, or for the prevention of storms.^k In 321 an edict was issued for the general observance of Sunday. Agricultural labours were to be carried on, but in the towns there was to be a cessation from traffic and from judicial business; and even the heathen soldiers were obliged to repeat on that day a prayer to the Supreme Deity.^l In the same year, as a concession to the zeal of the Christians for celibacy, the old laws against unmarried and childless persons were abolished;^m and by another edict the Church was allowed to receive legacies—a privilege which, in the event, had an important effect on its temporal condition.ⁿ

But as to all these enactments and proceedings, it is questionable in how far they may be regarded as evidence of the emperor's personal dispositions towards Christianity. The omission of the secular games, and the slight offered to the Capitoline Jupiter, need not have meant anything beyond a contempt for the popular religion.^o The laws which conferred privileges and removed disabilities did no more than put the Christian community on a level with the heathens, and even with the Jews. The private divinations condemned by Constantine were not properly a part of the old religion, but rather were a corruption which a reformer of that religion would have wished to abolish; they were, moreover, objectionable on political grounds, and had therefore been censured by Diocletian, by Tiberius, and even in the laws of the Twelve Tables.^p Nay, even the law for the observance of Sunday—the festival of the Sun, or Apollo, called by its heathen name—while it had its special and sacred meaning for Christians, might have been regarded by the rest of Constantine's subjects as merely adding to the number of holidays by an exercise of the emperor's pontifical power.^q

ⁱ Cod. Theod. IX. xvi. 1-2.

^k Ib. 3.

^l Euseb. iv. 18-20. Eusebius also speaks (c. 18) of a law for the observance of Friday, but it was probably of later date. Gieseler, I. i. 274.

^m Cod. Theod. VIII. xvi. 1; Euseb. iv. 26.

ⁿ Cod. Theod. XVI. ii. 4; Schröckh, v. 91-2.

^o Beugnot, i. 75.

^p Beugnot, i. 81-2; Miln. iii. 359-60. Prince A. de Broglie remarks, that Constantine had the advantage of being able to attack the very heart of paganism without altering the laws. i. 309. Comp. i. 346.

^q Mosh. 975; Beugnot, i. 83; Gieseler, I. i. 272-4.

religious policy
 In seeking to understand Constantine's policy as to religion, we must distinguish between the sovereign and the man. As emperor, he desired that his subjects should live in peace and order, and that the framework of the constitution should be preserved; in this capacity, therefore, it was his interest not to offend the prejudices of his people, to extend to all an equal protection, to allow in religion a freedom of thought limited only by the necessities of civil government. In his private opinions, which were probably at first vaguely monotheistic, he received a determination in favour of Christianity about the time of his march against Maxentius, and thenceforth advanced by degrees until at length he openly avowed the faith of the Gospel. By thus considering separately his official and his personal character, we may perhaps best understand much that at first sight appears inconsistent; how he retained throughout his life the office of Pontifex Maximus, the highest in the pagan hierarchy;^r how he took part in heathen ceremonies, regarding them as attached to his imperial function; how, in two edicts of the same year, he "enjoined the solemn observance of Sunday, and directed the regular consultation of the Aruspices."^s

The joint triumph of Constantine and Licinius over Maxentius and Maximin was soon followed by differences which
 A.D. 314. were decided by the defeat of Licinius in the battles of Cibalis and Mardia.^t A new partition of the empire assigned all Europe, except Thrace, to Constantine; but a revival of jealousies
 Sept. 323. produced another war, which ended in the ruin of Licinius. (Clinton). This prince, whom some writers have very improbably supposed to have been once a catechumen,^u oppressed his Christian subjects, perhaps regarding their religion as a token of inclination to his rival's interest. He demolished churches, put some bishops to death, and it is said that he was on the point of giving orders for a general persecution when he was diverted by the progress of Constantine. The emperors mustered their hosts under the standards of Christ and of heathenism respectively; each party relied on presages and visions which were supposed to come from heaven; and the triumph of Constantine was especially ascribed

^r Pagi (in Bar. A.D. 312. 100) and Tillemont (Emp. iv. 635) argue that, though the title was given by the pagan subjects, the acceptance of it by Christian emperors is not proved. It conferred much influence, and did not require any actual idolatry. Schröckh, v. 138. See Beugnot, i. 90-4; and chap. V. below.

^s Gibbon, ii. 145. The law as to the Aruspices is Cod. Theod. XVI. x. 1. See Pagi in Baron. iv. 24-6; Mosh. 973-4; Heinichen in Euseb. de V. Const. 511; Neander, iii. 26-8; Beugnot, i. 89.

^t Gibbon, i. 439-41.

^u See Pagi in Baron. iii. 637; Tillemont. Emp. iv. 503; Broglie, i. 316.

to the God of Christians. From that time pagan emblems disappear from his coins, and he declares himself in his edicts to be an instrument of God for spreading the true faith.^x

Constantine now recalled all Christians who were in exile or in the mines; he ordered that those who had been deprived of public employments on account of their religion should be reinstated, that the property of martyrs should be restored to their heirs, and that, if no heirs could be discovered, it should be given to the Church.^y In an edict addressed to all his subjects, he advised them to embrace the Gospel; but at the same time he professed to wish that it should be advanced by means of persuasion only.^z He endeavoured, however, to render it attractive by bestowing employments and honours on proselytes of the higher classes, and by donations to the poor—a course which, as Eusebius himself acknowledges, produced a great amount of hypocrisy and pretended conversion.^a He ordered that churches should be everywhere built, of a size sufficient to accommodate the whole population.^b He forbade the erection of images of the gods,^c and would not allow his own statue to be set up in temples.^d All state sacrifices were prohibited, and such of the provincial governors and officials as adhered to the old religion were ordered to abstain from rites of this kind; yet other public sacrifices—those which were undertaken by the priests, as distinguished from ceremonies performed in the name of the state—were allowed to continue. There is reason to suppose that in the end of his reign Constantine issued an edict against them, but if so it was little enforced.^e

While the emperor exerted himself for the elevation of the Christian community, he refrained from any such attacks on the religion of the majority as would have been likely to excite opposition.^f His measures were intended to appear as a reform of abuses which had crept into the pagan system—not as directed against the system itself. Commissioners were sent throughout the empire, with instructions to visit the temples, and to inquire into the worship which was performed in them; and although unarmed, and

^x Euseb. Hist. Eccl. x. 8; Vit. Const. i. 51-6; ii. 1-17; Socr. i. 3; Giesel. I. i. 275. Licinius was allowed to retire to Thessalonica, where he was put to death in the following year, "contra jus sacramenti," according to St. Jerome (Chron. t. viii. 671), while other Christian writers impute treasonable designs to him. See Gibbon, i. 450; Broglie, i. 327.

^y Euseb. ii. 20-1.

^z Ibid. 24-42, 56.

^a Ibid. iii. 21, 58; iv. 1, 28, 38.

^b Ibid. ii. 45.

^c Ibid.

^d Ibid. iv. 16. See Schröckh, v. 103.

^e Ibid. ii. 44-5. The law against all sacrifices does not exist, but is mentioned by Constantius, Cod. Theod. XVI. x. 2. See Giesel. I. iii. 8; Milman, ii. 460-3.

^f Beugnot, i. 71-3; 98-101; Gibbon, ii. 245-6.

unprotected by any military guard, they were allowed to do their work without hindrance—a circumstance which shows how little hold the heathen religion retained on the general mind. In consequence of this visitation, many statues were stripped of their precious ornaments, destroyed, or carried away, and many impostures of the priests were exposed.^g Constantine respected the temples in general, but he shut up and unroofed some which were almost deserted, turned others into churches, and destroyed those which had been the scenes of immoral rites or of pretended miracles.^h

The change in the position of Rome towards the empire, which had originated in the policy or in the caprice of Diocletian, was carried further by Constantine. He paid only two visits to the city after that which followed his victory over Maxentius; and his reception was not such as to make a favourable impression on his mind.ⁱ With wonderful speed a new capital, called after the emperor's name, was raised on the site of Byzantium.^k Whereas Rome was the chief stronghold of heathenism,^l Constantinople was to be a Christian city. Churches were erected in every quarter. Statues of gods and illustrious men were removed from the cities and temples of Greece and Asia^m to decorate the streets and public places, while they served as trophies of victory over the old religion. The chief room of the palace was adorned with representations of sacred subjects, among which was one of the Crucifixion. The gladiatorial shows, and other barbarous exhibitions which formed the delight of the Romans, were never allowed at Constantinople, although in the elder capital the popular feeling was as yet so strong that the emperor did not venture to interfere with it.ⁿ

In the outward duties of religion Constantine was very diligent. He caused himself to be represented as praying on coins and medals and in statues;^o he studied the Scriptures,^p and regularly

^g The proceedings of the Royal Commissioners under Henry VIII and Edward VI. suggest a parallel which continually recurs throughout the history of the abolition of paganism.

^h Euseb. iii. 54–8.

ⁱ Gibbon, i. 434; Broglie, ii. 92–5. The pagan Zosimus says that Constantine built his new capital because he was unable to bear the execrations of the Romans on account of his having put his wife and son to death. ii. 30.

^k Tillemont says that it was founded in 328 and ready for occupation in 330 (Emp. iv. 230). Comp. Pagi in Baron. iv. 75–8; Gibbon, ii. 17; De Broglie, ii. c. 6.

^l Beugnot, i. 97; Broglie, ii. 91.

^m “Constantinopolis dedicatur, pœne omnium urbium nuditate.”—Hieron. Chron. A.D. 334; cf. Zosim. v. 24; Chron. Pasch. A.D. 328.

ⁿ Euseb. iii. 48–9; iv. 25; Sozom. ii. 5; Tillem. iv. 209; Schröckh, v. 104–5. There is a law of Constantine against the “bloody spectacles” of gladiators (Cod. Theod. XV. xiii. 1, A.D. 325); but Godefroy shows in his comment that it was intended only for the East, or, perhaps, only for Phœnicia. For the abolition of these spectacles at Rome see below, c. vii.

^o Euseb. iv. 15. ^p Ib. i. 32; iv. 17.

attended the services of the Church; he kept the paschal vigil with great devotion;^q he listened, standing, to the longest addresses of his bishops;^r he even composed religious discourses, and after they had been translated from Latin into Greek, with which he was but imperfectly acquainted, delivered them before his court.^s One of these is still extant, having been preserved as a specimen by Eusebius, to whom it is probably indebted for more than its Greek idiom.^t In this composition the emperor recommends the Christian religion, dwelling on the evidence borne by prophecy, with which he classes the Sibylline verses and the fourth Eclogue of Virgil; and, as was his custom, insisting strongly on the contrast between his own prosperity and the fate of princes who had persecuted the Church. In his journeys he was accompanied by a travelling chapel.^u Bishops were his chosen associates; and too many of them were dazzled by the splendour of such a position, so that he found them willing to let his faults pass uncensured, and to admit a dangerous amount of interference in spiritual things.^x Eusebius^y relates that one of these bishops—probably himself—went so far in flattering the emperor with assurances of salvation as to incur a rebuke from Constantine himself.^z It has indeed been maintained that Constantine's Christianity was merely a matter of policy, but the charge is palpably unjust; for although some of his measures as to religion were unquestionably dictated by political interest, although his understanding of Christian doctrine was very imperfect, and his life was far from being that of a consistent believer, there is no reasonable ground for doubting that his conviction was sincere, and that he earnestly endeavoured to employ his power for the benefit of the Church and for the extension of the truth.^z

The emperor's mother, Helena, was induced by him to embrace his new religion;^a and during the remaining years of her life distinguished herself by the fervour of her zeal and devotion. In 326 she visited the Holy Land, with the intention of seeking out the

^q Ib. iv. 22.^r Ib. 33.^s Ib. 29, 32.^t Broglie, ii. 79.^u Euseb. ii. 12; Tillem. Emp. iv. 291.^x Schröckh, v. 109, 113, 397; Neander, iii. 31-2; Newman on Arianism, 284. On Constantine's relations to the Church, see below, ch. vi.^y iv. 48.^z Mosh. 970; Schröckh, v. 139-141, 395-8; Planck, i. 243-5; Neander, vi. 369; Broglie, passim. Niebuhr says of

him that "he had taken up the Christian faith as a superstition, and had mixed it with all the rest of his superstition." Vortr. ed. Isler. iii. 302.

^a So Eusebius expressly states (iii. 47); and there seems to be no sufficient ground for the belief of many writers that she had been a Christian before Constantine, and had brought him up in the faith, or had influenced his conversion.

places which had been hallowed by the chief events of Scripture history. The site of the Holy Sepulchre was to be marked by a church which should exceed all others in splendour.^b The temple of Venus, with which Hadrian had defiled the spot, was demolished; the earth below it was dug up as polluted, when, it is said, three crosses were discovered, and near them the label on which the superscription had been written over the Saviour's head. As, however, there was not enough to distinguish with certainty the cross on which He had suffered, Macarius, bishop of the city, proposed a test. A lady of his flock, who was supposed to be at the point of death, was brought; prayers were put up that the true cross might be revealed through her cure; and, after two of the three had been applied to her in vain, the third wrought an instantaneous recovery.^c In addition to the place of the Entombment, those of the Nativity and the Ascension, and that of the oak or turpentine-tree of Mamre, were covered with churches, in token of Helena's piety, and of the unrestricted bounty which Constantine enabled her to exercise.^d

The reign of Constantine was marked by the beginning of two great controversies—the Donatistic and the Arian: the former arising in the west out of a disagreement as to discipline; the latter, of eastern origin, involving the very essence of Christian doctrine. The emperor took part in both, but the goodness of his intentions was not always judiciously carried out. Wielding an absolute power, and imperfectly instructed as to the faith which he professed, he was continually tempted to confound religious with civil considerations. Sometimes the desire to preserve peace among his subjects induced him to view error with indifference; at other times he regarded and punished the proceedings of religious parties as offences against his imperial authority.

II. We have repeatedly had occasion to notice the peculiar character which marked the Christianity of Northern Africa. In that country Montanism had found a congenial soil, and had acquired its great champion, Tertullian. From Africa, too, it was that the Novatianist sect had in part derived its origin; and there

^b Euseb. iii. 25-6, 31; Soc. 1-9.

^c Soc. i. 17; Soz. ii. 1; Theod. i. 18. Eusebius, while he minutely describes the discovery of the sepulchre (iii. 25-8), says nothing of the cross. Moreover, according to him, the excavations were made by order of Constantine, and before Helena's pilgrimage. Nor is the cross mentioned by a Gaulish pilgrim

who described Jerusalem seven years after Helena's visit (Itiner. Burdigalense, Patrol. viii. 790-2). See Gieseler, I. ii. 279, for the growth of the story, which, however, is defended by Dr. Newman (On Miracles, 146-7), and Prince A. de Broglie, ii. 119.

^d Euseb. iii. 41-3, 47, 51-2; Soz. ii. 4.

its rigid principles had been received with the greatest enthusiasm. There the strict view as to the nullity of schismatical baptism had been maintained by Cyprian; and in the history of that eminent bishop we have seen the extravagant honour which the Christians of Africa attached to the outward acts of martyrdom and confessorship.

In the persecution under Diocletian many of the African Christians exhibited the characteristic spirit of their country.^e They endeavoured to provoke martyrdom by violent behaviour; in some cases, it is said, they were impelled to this by debts, disrepute, or wretchedness, and by the hope of at once washing away in their blood the sins and crimes of a whole life.^f

Mensurius, bishop of Carthage, was strongly opposed to such courses. He himself, when asked to give up the sacred books of his church, substituted for them some heretical writings.^g He forbade his people to visit in prison those who had ostentatiously courted death; he refused to acknowledge such persons as martyrs;^h and in carrying out this policy his chief instrument was his archdeacon, Cæcilian.

In the year 305, a synod of about twelve bishops met at Cirta (now Constantine) to elect a bishop for that city. The president, Secundus, bishop of Tigisis and primate of Numidia,ⁱ began by inquiring into the conduct of his brethren during the late persecution. Several confessed that they had delivered up the Scriptures; one, Purpurius by name, on being charged with the murder of two of his nephews, told Secundus that he was not to be frightened by such questions; that he had killed, and would kill, all who stood in his way;^k and he taxed Secundus himself with being a traditor. When the inquiry had proceeded so far as to inculcate the greater part of the bishops who were present, one of them proposed that, for the sake of peace, past offences should be forgotten. His suggestion was adopted, and the synod proceeded to elect a traditor, Silvanus, to the see of Cirta. The very persons

^e For documents relating to the Donatistic schism, see Dupin's Appendix to St. Optatus, and the Appendix to the ixth volume of St. Augustine (Patrol. tt. viii., xi., xliii.).

^f Augustin. Brevicul. Collat. c. Donatistis, iii. 25.

^g See above, page 146. The Donatists afterwards maintained, (1) that, if this story were true, Mensurius acted wrongly; (2) that it was not true, but that the books which he gave up were the Scriptures, Aug. loc. cit.

^h Aug. ib.; Neander, iii. 259-260. This was in accordance with the judgment of his contemporary St. Peter of Alexandria (Routh, Rel. Sac. iv. 32-7), and with the lxth Canon of the Council of Eliberis (see p. 149). Comp. Jer. Taylor, ed. Eden, iv. 580.

ⁱ In Numidia the primacy was not permanently attached to one see, but belonged to the senior bishop. Bingham, II. xvi. 6; Münter, Primordia, 49.

^k "The language of Purpurius is that of a furious madman." Gibbon, ii. 186.

who on this occasion were so lenient towards the crime of treasonship became afterwards the chief leaders of the more rigid party.¹

Although Mensurius had incurred much enmity by his conduct during the persecution, the spirit which he had provoked did not break out into any considerable manifestation during his lifetime.^m On his death, which took place in 311, as he was returning from Rome, where he had been summoned to appear before Maxentius, two presbyters, named Botrus and Celesius, aspired to the vacant see, and, for their own purposes, contrived that the election should take place without summoning the Numidian bishops.ⁿ The choice, however, fell on the archdeacon Cæcilian, who was consecrated by Felix, bishop of Aptunga. Before leaving Carthage, Mensurius had intrusted some plate and other property of the Church to certain elders of the congregation,^o and had left an inventory in the hands of a female member of his flock. The document was now delivered to Cæcilian; he demanded the articles from the elders; and these persons, who had supposed themselves secure against inquiry, and had intended to appropriate the deposit, endeavoured to avenge themselves by forming a party in opposition to the new bishop.^p The faction was joined by the disappointed presbyters, and was supported by the influence and wealth of Lucilla, a lady whom Cæcilian had formerly offended by reproving her for a practice of kissing the bone of a supposed martyr before partaking of the Eucharist.^q In consequence of an invitation from the malcontents, a body of Numidian bishops, seventy in number, and headed by Secundus, appeared at Carthage. They cited Cæcilian before them, alleging that he ought not to have been consecrated except in their presence, and by the primate of Numidia; and, moreover, that his consecration was void, inasmuch as Felix of Aptunga was a traditor.^r Personal charges were also

¹ Acta Conc. Cirt. ap. Aug. c. Crescon. iii. 30, seqq.; iv. 36; Brevic. Coll. iii. 17; Optatus, i. 15; Aug. Ep. 43.

^m Tillemont (vi. 4-5, 697-8) supposes that a schism was formed against him, but that it was soon suppressed. See Walch, iv. 77-85.

ⁿ Optat. i. 17-8.

^o *Seniores plebis*, in whom some Presbyterian writers wish us to recognize the "lay elders" of Calvin's discipline. But, as Bingham (II. xix. 19) observes, they seem to have been officers answering to our *churchwardens*. See Thorndike, i. 164-6, ed. Ang. Cath. Lib.

Walch (iv. 72) supposes them to have been clergy.

^p Optat. i. 17-8. Neander (iii. 266) questions the story as to their motives for joining the Numidians.

^q Optat. i. 16. Cardinal Wiseman, in his ingenious *jeu d'esprit* on Donatism and Anglicanism, finds a parallel for Lucilla in Anna Boleyn! Essays, ii. 210.

^r Opt. i. 19. The charges against Felix were afterwards fully disproved. Gesta Purgationis Felicis, in Dupin, 254 seqq. or Routh, Reliq. iv.; Optat. i. 27; Walch, iv. 41-52.

brought against Cæcilian. His exertions to check the fanatical spirit during the persecution were exaggerated into monstrous inhumanity; it was said that he had stationed men at the prison-doors, with whips in their hands, to drive away such of the faithful as should carry provisions for the relief of the martyrs; that he himself had beaten some persons who went to the prison on this errand of charity; that he had broken the vessels which they carried, and had scattered the food, so that some of the prisoners had in consequence been starved to death.^s Cæcilian refused to appear before the Numidians, but professed himself willing to satisfy them if they would go to him; he maintained that his consecration was regular and valid, and offered, if they could prove it otherwise, to submit to a fresh consecration at their hands.^t On this Purpurius broke out with his usual violence: "Let him come," he said, "to receive our imposition of hands, and we will break his head by way of penance."^u The Numidians excommunicated Cæcilian with his adherents, and ordained a rival bishop, Majorinus, who had formerly been a reader under him, but was now a member of Lucilla's household. This formation of a decided schism induced many persons, who had before stood aloof from Cæcilian, to return to his communion.^x

Constantine, soon after becoming master of the West by his victory over Maxentius, sent a large sum of money for the relief of the African Christians; and as reports which A.D. 313. had reached him had produced impressions unfavourable to the malcontent party, he ordered that his gifts, with the privileges conferred on Christians by his late edicts,^y should be confined to those who were in communion with Cæcilian; while he used some harsh language as to the "madness" of their opponents.^z These hereupon, through the proconsul Anulinus, presented to the emperor a petition, desiring that their cause might be examined by the bishops of Gaul, from whom it was supposed that impartiality might be expected, as their country had been exempt from the late persecution, and consequently had escaped the difficulties and dissensions con-

^s Acta Saturnini, 17, in Dupin, 242, or Patrol. viii. 700-1.

^t Optat. i. 19. From the number of arguments brought in support of the consecration, Neander (iii. 265) suspects that the Numidians had precedent on their side in insisting that they ought to have been consulted; but that the matter had not been absolutely settled (cf. Bindemann, Augustinus, ii.

380). Cæcilian's offer was probably ironical, as St. Augustine suggests. Brevic. Collat. iii. 16. See Walch, iv. 91; Broglie, i. 259.

^u Optatus, i. 19, translated by Gibbon, ii. 186.

^x Optat. ib.; Aug. de Unit. Eccl. 73.

^y See above, p. 151.

^z Euseb. Hist. Eccl. x. 5-6.

nected with the question of giving up the Scriptures.^a Even such an application to the civil power—a request that it would appoint a commission of ecclesiastical judges—was strongly contrasted with the attitude which the Donatists afterwards assumed towards the State; and their adversaries did not fail in later times to remind them from which party the original appeal had proceeded.^b

Constantine complied with their request by issuing a commission to the bishops of Cologne, Autun, and Arles, with whom he
A.D. 313. joined Melchiades (or Miltiades), of Rome, and another;^c but it was afterwards extended, so that the body before which the cause was tried consisted of about twenty bishops, who in October, 313,^d assembled in the Lateran, then the palace of the Empress Fausta. Cæcilian attended, with ten bishops of his party, and a like number of accusers appeared, headed by Donatus, bishop of Casæ Nigræ, in Numidia. The decision was in favour of Cæcilian, and Melchiades proposed a conciliatory expedient—that both parties should reunite in communion, and that, where rival bishops laid claim to a see, the one who had the earlier consecration should keep possession.^e Donatus and his brethren, however, disdained all compromise. They complained that their cause had not been sufficiently examined; they renewed their charges; they accused the judges of corruption; they declared that a synod of only twenty bishops was insufficient to overrule the sentence of the seventy who had condemned Cæcilian; and they prayed the emperor to grant them a further hearing.^f

On this Constantine summoned a council from all parts of the Western empire, to meet at Arles, whither the judges, the accusers, and the accused were conveyed at the public expense.^g About two hundred bishops, the greatest ecclesiastical assembly that had yet been known, met on the first of August, 314, under the presidency of Marinus, bishop of Arles.^h The bishops of Rome and of Ostia were represented by deputies. The deliberations of the council resulted in a fresh acquittal of Cæcilian, and some canons were passed with a view to the African dissensions.ⁱ It was enacted that clergymen who had given up the Scriptures, the sacred vessels, or

^a Anulin. ap. Aug. Ep. lxxxviii. 2; vi. 32; xi. 930; Broglie, i. 263. Optat. i. 22.

^b Optat. i. 22; Aug. Ep. lxxxviii. 5; c. Crescon. iii. 67, and elsewhere.

^c Euseb. H. E. x. 5. *Μιλτιάδης ἐστὶν Παρμ. καὶ Μάρκων*. Some (as Tillemont, vi. 30) suppose the second name to mean Mirocles, bishop of Milan; others, a Roman presbyter or deacon, Mark, who became bishop in 336. See Patrol.

vi. 32; xi. 930; Broglie, i. 263.

^d Tillem. vi. 31–3.

^e Aug. Ep. xliii. 16.

^f Optat. i. 23–4; Aug. Ep. 43.

^g Dupin, Monum. 283; Patrol. viii. 483–6.

^h See Nat. Alex. vii. 370.

ⁱ Hardouin, i. 263–6; Patrol. viii. 815.

the lists of the faithful, should be deposed, if convicted by the evidence of public records, but that mere hearsay testimony was not to be admitted in such cases; that false accusers should be excluded from communion, and not readmitted until in prospect of death; that if a person, in himself unexceptionable, should have been ordained by a traditor, his ordination should stand valid.^k And, for the settlement of the old question as to baptism, it was decided that, where a person had received baptism from heretics in the name of the Trinity, he should be admitted into the Church by imposition of hands for the conveying of the Holy Spirit; but that, if the proper form of words had not been used, he should be re-baptized.^l

The defeated party entreated the emperor to take the matter into his own hands—a request in glaring contradiction to the principles which they afterwards maintained as to the independence of the ecclesiastical power. Although offended by their obstinacy, Constantine agreed,^m and, after some delays, the question was heard before him at Milan, where he gave a sentence to the same effect with those already pronounced by the ^{A.D. 316.} synods of Rome and Arles.ⁿ The judgment was followed up by severe edicts against the sectaries. They were deprived of their churches; many of them suffered banishment and confiscation; even the punishment of death was enacted against them, although it does not appear that this law was enforced in any case during the reign of Constantine.^o

Majorinus is supposed to have died in 315, or earlier,^p and was succeeded in the schismatical episcopate by Donatus “the Great”—so styled by his followers for the sake of distinction from the bishop of Casæ Nigræ. It was from this second Donatus that the sect, which had before been known as “the party of Majorinus,”^q took the name which it bears in history. He is described as learned, eloquent, a voluminous writer, a man of rigid life, but of excessive pride. He is said to have been desirous that his followers, instead of being styled Christians, in common with their opponents, should be called after himself (although at a later time they resented the appellation); to have carried himself loftily

^k Cc. 13-4. Baronius (314. 63), as Tillemont (vi. 49) points out, gives a reading of the 13th canon which entirely inverts its meaning.

^l C. 8. See Greg. Magn. Ep. xi. 67.

^m Patrol. viii. 487-492. St. Augustine seems to say that he afterwards begged the bishops to pardon this inter-

ference. Ep. xliiii. 20.

ⁿ Aug. c. Crescon. iii. 82. For the order of events, see Walch, iv. 136-9.

^o Aug. Ep. lxxxviii. 3; cv. 9; c. Litt. Petil. ii. 205; Tillem. vi. 62-3; Schröckh, v. 288.

^p Tillem. vi. 64; Neand. iii. 270.

^q “Pars Majorini.”

towards the other bishops of his communion; to have scorned to receive the Eucharist in public; to have been very intemperate in his language towards all who differed from him. His partisans boasted of his miracles and of the answers which he had received to prayer,^r and are charged with paying him honours which trenched on those due to the Deity—with singing hymns to him, and swearing by his grey hairs.^s The character of the sectaries answered to that of their chief. They displayed an extreme austerity, which was too often a pretext for the neglect of the more unpretending duties of morality and religion.^t They professed to embody in each individual that holiness which Scripture ascribes to the ideal Church of Christ as a whole.^u They held that the true Church existed only in their own communion, which, with the exception of one scanty congregation at Rome and the private chapel of a wealthy female Donatist in Spain, was limited to a corner of Africa.^x They boasted of miracles and revelations.^y They rebaptised proselytes, and compelled virgins who joined the party to submit to penance, and renew their vows.^z

Constantine soon began to perceive that against such fanaticism force would be as unavailing as reason. In 317 he wrote to the Catholic bishops of Africa, exhorting them to treat the schismatics with gentleness;^a and when, in 321, the Donatists presented to him a memorial, in which they declared that they would have nothing to do with his “scoundrel of a bishop,”^b he repealed the laws against them, and allowed their exiles to return—expressing a horror of their frenzy and turbulence, but declaring that he left them to the judgment of God.^c This policy of indulgence was continued throughout the remaining years of the reign, during which the emperor’s attention was drawn away from the African schism by the nearer and more widely-spread Arian controversy.^d In the meanwhile the Donatists became the stronger party in

^r Aug. de Unit. Eccl. 49; In Joann. Tract. xiii. 17.

^s Optat. iii. 3. St. Augustine says that Donatus left writings which were heretical as to the doctrines relating to the Godhead; but that the sect neither adopted his heterodoxy nor, apparently, knew of it (De Hæres. 69). The Arians vainly attempted to establish a correspondence with the Donatists. Aug. Ep. clxxxv. 12; Baron. 321. 19; Walch, iv. 324-9.

^t Tillem. vi. 74-5.

^u Guericke, i. 376-7.

^x Optat. ii. 4; Aug. c. Litt. Petil. ii. 247; De Unit. Eccl. 6. The editors of

Augustine suppose Lucilla to have been the Spanish patroness.

^y Augustin. de Unit. Eccl. 49; In Joann., Tr. xiii. 17; Ep. 53.

^z Optat. v.; Aug. de Hæres. 69. The rebaptism of converts was not instituted by Donatus himself (Aug. Retract. i. 21), and was declared to be needless by a Donatistic Council in 330, but was afterwards resumed. Tillem. vi. 81.

^a Dupin, Monum. 294.

^b “Antistiti ipsius nebuloni.”—Aug. Brev. Collat. iii. 39.

^c Aug. ad Donatist. post Collat. 56; Euseb. V. C. i. 45.

^d Tillem. vi. 105-7.

Africa. A synod of the sect in 330 was attended by two hundred and seventy bishops, and the whole number of their bishops is said to have at one time amounted to four hundred.^e

The appearance of the Circumcellions among the Donatists is placed by some writers as early as 317, while others date it a quarter of a century later.^f These were persons of the poorest class, ignorant of any language but the Punic; their name was derived from the practice of begging *around* the *cells* or cottages of the country people, instead of earning a livelihood by regular industry.^g The accounts of them might be disbelieved, as fictions of their enemies, were it not that later experience forbids us to be hasty in rejecting statements of extravagances and crimes committed under the name of religion.^h Their zeal was often combined with excesses of drunkenness and lust; and in these the "sacred virgins" of the party shared.ⁱ Bands of both sexes roamed about the country, keeping the peaceable inhabitants in constant terror. They styled themselves the Lord's Champions;^k their shout of "Praises to God" was heard, according to St. Augustine, with greater dread than the roaring of a lion.^l Supposing that our Lord's words to St. Peter (Matt. xxvi. 52) forbade them the use of swords, they first carried no other weapon than heavy clubs, called *Israels*, with which they beat their victims—often to death; but the scriptural scruple was afterwards overcome, and they added to their "Israels" not only slings, but swords, lances, and hatchets.^m They attacked and plundered the churches and houses of the Catholic clergy; they committed violent outrages on their persons; in later days they used to put out their eyes with a mixture of lime and vinegar.ⁿ Professing to redress the wrongs of society, they interfered between creditors and their debtors, between masters and their slaves; offences which deserved punishment were allowed to pass unnoticed, lest the Circumcellions should be called in by the culprits; all property was unsafe in the region infested by these furious fanatics; and the officers of justice were afraid to perform their functions.^o

^e Ib. 82-6; Gibbon, ii. 188.

^f Tillem. vi. 96, 828; Walch, iv. 157; Neander, iii. 272-3.

^g Aug. c. Gaudent. i. 32; Milman, ii. 376.

^h Gibbon (ii. 243) mentions the Camisards as a parallel. In our own island we have had the Covenanters of a former age, and it appears that the worst features of *their* system exist at this day. See the Quart. Rev. No. 178, Art. 'Puritanism in the Highlands.'

ⁱ Aug. c. Litt. Petil. i. 26; ii. 195; De Unit. Eccl. 50; Tillem. vi. 88-9, 94.

^k "Agonistici," Optat. iii. 4.

^l Optat. iii. 4; Aug. c. Crescon. iii. 46; Enarr. in Psalm. cxxxii. 3, 6.

^m Aug. Enarr. in Psalm. x. 5; c. Cresc. iii. 46; c. Litt. Pet. ii. 195.

ⁿ Aug. Ep. lxxxviii. 8; c. Cresc. iii. 46. This was not until A.D. 405.

^o Optat. iii. 4; Aug. Ep. clxxxv. 12, 15.

The frenzy of the Circumcellions was directed against themselves as well as others. Sometimes they courted death by violently disturbing the pagan worship.^p They stopped travellers on the roads, and, with threats of killing them, demanded death at their hands.^q In the same way they compelled judges who were travelling on their circuits to hand them over to the executioners.^r Many drowned themselves, rushed into fire, or threw themselves from precipices; but hanging was a death which they eschewed, as they would have nothing in common with the *traditor* Judas.^s The more moderate Donatists disapproved and dreaded the excesses of the Circumcellions. Councils of the sect condemned suicide; but the practice continued, and those who procured or perpetrated their own death were popularly honoured as martyrs.^t

Constans, who succeeded to the western part of his father's empire, endeavoured to conciliate the Donatists by the same system of presents which had been found effectual in winning proselytes from heathenism to the Church. It would seem that three such attempts were made:^u the agents in the last of them were Paul and Macarius, who were sent into Africa in 347. When these commissioners invited all Christians to share in the emperor's gifts, Donatus repelled the offers with a great show of indignation; "What," he asked, "has the emperor to do with the Church?"—and he forbade the members of his communion to accept anything from traditors.^x It was reported that the commissioners were charged to set up the emperor's image in churches, for the purpose of adoration.^y The Circumcellions rose in revolt, and a battle was fought, in which the imperial troops were victorious—two Donatist bishops, the chief instigators of the insurrection, being among the slain.^z Macarius then required the sectaries to return

^p Aug. Ep. clxxxv. 12; c. Gaudent. i. 32. Gieseler supposes that this must have been between the revival of paganism under Julian and Gratian's measures for its suppression. I. ii. 105.

^q Aug. de Unit. Eccl. 50.

^r One judge who was thus assaulted ingeniously disappointed the applicants. He ordered the executioners to bind them, as if for death; and when they were thus rendered harmless, he left them. Aug. Ep. clxxxv. 12. Another version of the story is given by Theodoret, Haeres. iv. 6.

^s Optat. iii. 4-5. Augustine will not let them escape by this way. "Frustra omnino; nam ille Judam traditorem

id facere compulit, qui et illum puerum, quem Dominus sanavit, in aquam et ignem sæpe dejecit, et gregem porcorum in mare præcipitavit, et ipsi Domino præcipitum de pinna Templi audaci præsumptione suggessit. Quamvis itaque diversis modis voluntariam vos præcipientis in mortem, tamen ejusdem diaboli instinctu vos ipsos necando imitamini traditorem." C. Gaudent. i. 49.

^t Aug. c. Litt. Petil. ii. 114; Ep. clxxxv. 16; Walch, iv. 162-6.

^u Neander, iii. 274-6.

^x Optat. iii. 3.

^y Ib. 12.

^z Ib. 6-8. See the "Passions" of those "martyrs" in Dupin, 303, seqq.

to the Church, and sentenced those who refused to banishment. Optatus, the chief controversial opponent of Donatism until the time of Augustine, acknowledges that they were treated with harshness, but assures us that this was contrary to the wishes of the Catholic bishops.^a The Donatists in Augustine's day used to speak of the "times of Macarius"^b as those in which their forefathers had been most severely tried; and they affected to call the Catholics *Macarians*, in memory of the persecutor.^c By the vigorous measures employed against them, the schism appeared to be suppressed for a time, and Donatus died in exile.^d

III. The distinctive tenet of Arianism—the denial of the Saviour's Godhead—had already appeared in the heresies of the Ebionites, of Artemon, and of Theodotus. But now that Christianity had assumed a new position, questions of doctrine produced an amount of agitation before unknown; the Arian controversy, and some which followed it, were not only felt throughout the whole Church, regarded as a spiritual body, but had an important influence on political affairs. And, sad as it undoubtedly is to contemplate the distractions thus occasioned, we must yet remember that by fighting out these differences, instead of attempting to stifle them by compromise, the Church gained a fixed and definite form of sound words, which was of the greatest value, and even necessity, for the preservation of her faith through the following ages of ignorance.^e

Although Alexandria was the birthplace of Arianism, the origin of the heresy is rather to be traced to the other great Church of the East, over which Paul of Samosata had exerted an important and lasting influence. While the Alexandrian tendency was spiritual and mystical, the theologians of Antioch were given to dialectic subtleties, and were more distinguished for acuteness than for largeness or depth of mind;^f and such was the tone which prevailed in the school of Lucian, an eminent teacher whose history has already been noticed.^g Lucian, induced rather by a sympathy with Paul's spirit than by an agreement in his opinions, left the Church with the bishop, or in consequence of his condemnation; and although he afterwards returned, and is honoured as a martyr,

^a iii. 2.^b "Tempora Macariana." Enarr. in Psalm. x. 5.^c Aug. Ep. xxiii. 6; xlv. 45; c. Litt. Petil. ii. 94.^d Baron. 348. 27.^e Guericke, i. 413-4; Dorner, i. 806.^f Neander, iii. 500, iv. 3; Gieseler, I. ii. 45; Newman on Arianism, 10-26, 33, 122; Dorner, ii. 28-9.^g Sup. p. 150.

the effects of his teaching remained for evil. The Arians claimed him as their founder. Among his pupils were Arius himself, Eusebius of Nicomedia, Leontius, and other persons of eminence in the party.^h

Arius is supposed to have been, like Sabellius, a native of Libya or Cyrenaica.ⁱ He is described as a man of strict life, of grave appearance, and agreeable manners—with an air of modesty, under which, according to his enemies, he concealed strong feelings of vanity and ambition.^k After studying in the schools of Antioch, he was ordained deacon by Peter, of Alexandria, about the beginning of the century. He then became connected with a party which Meletius, bishop of Lycopolis, the second in rank of the Egyptian sees, had formed on grounds which appear to have resembled those of the Donatistic schism.^l For this, Arius was excommunicated by Peter; but the next bishop, Achillas, read-

A.D. 311. mitted him to the Church, ordained him presbyter, and entrusted him with a parochial cure in the city.^m On the death of Achillas, after an episcopate of a few months, Arius is

A.D. 312. said by some writers to have aspired to the bishoprick; Philostorgius, a member of his party, even states that he had a majority of votes, and that he voluntarily gave way to

^h Philostorg. ii. 14; Kaye, 88. Walch (ii. 391-2) questions the statement as to Arius.

ⁱ Epiphanius. lxi. 1. See Walch, ii. 389-390.

^k Epiphanius. lxi. 3; Newman, n. on St. Athanasius. Orations, 183.

^l The Meletian schism took its rise from a persecution, which some writers (as Pagi, iv. 129-131, 308, 429; Clinton, A.D. 302) suppose to have been local, and date about 301, while others identify it with the great persecution of Diocletian, about 306. (Baron. 306; Tillemont. v. 434; Mosh. i. 359; Walch, iv. 383; Schröckh, v. 269.) That Peter took a moderate course towards those who had lapsed, is certain; but, while Epiphanius (lxviii. 3) represents Meletius as having separated from the Church on account of the Alexandrian bishop's lenity, others state that he himself was deposed for having sacrificed. (Athanasius. Apol. adv. Arianos, 59; Soc. i. 6.) The former opinion (although with some modifications from the account of Epiphanius, who is supposed to have been influenced by Meletian authorities) has been more generally received since the publication of some important documents by Maffei, in 1738. (See these

reprinted in the Reliquiæ Sacræ, iv. 91-4, with Dr. Routh's notes; also note in Mosh. i. 360; Walch, iv. 358-9, 366-9, 373-9; Schröckh, v. 266-9; Neander, iii. 308, seqq.; Kaye, 19-22.) Peter is said to have declared the baptism of the sect invalid. (Walch, iv. 384.) Meletius had at one time twenty-eight bishops in connexion with him. (Ib. 389.) The Council of Nicæa endeavoured to heal the breach; its 6th canon, which settled the jurisdiction of the Alexandrian primate (see below c. VI. iii. 6), is supposed to have been framed with special reference to the pretensions of Lycopolis. (Neander, iii. 308.) But the schism continued into the following century. Soc. i. 9; Soz. ii. 21; Tillemont. vi. 662-4, viii. 14; Schröckh, v. 271.

^m Epiphanius. lxi. 1-2. The parochial system was introduced at Alexandria earlier than in other cities, where the system usually was that the whole body of clergy were attached to the Mother Church, and thence served the district churches. (Thomassin, II. i. 22; Bingham, IX. viii. 5.) It has been said, but improbably, that Arius was even master of the Catechetical School. See Walch, ii. 395; Dorner, i. 811.

Alexander, who was elected.ⁿ But there is no good evidence for the story of his having been a candidate at all.^o

Amidst contradictory reports as to the beginning of the controversy, it seems to be certain that on some public occasion, when Alexander was discoursing on the unity of the ^{A.D. 319.} Divine Trinity, Arius charged his doctrine with Sabellianism.^p Alexander at first endeavoured to convince him of his error by friendly expostulations; but, finding that they were ineffectual, that he himself was blamed for tolerating Arius, and that a presbyter, named Colluthus, even made this the pretext for a schism,^q he appointed a conference, at which, after having heard the arguments on both sides with judicial impartiality, he decided against Arius. The condemnation was ratified by a synod of Egyptian and Libyan bishops; and the heresiarch with his adherents was excommunicated.^r

Arius found many to sympathize with him—partly from the attractiveness of a doctrine which brought down the mysteries of the Godhead to the sphere of human analogies and conceptions; partly because the multitude is usually ready to take part with any one who may suffer from the exercise of lawful authority.^s Among his followers were two bishops, about twelve presbyters and as many deacons, and a great number of virgins.^t He took refuge in Palestine, and a lively correspondence followed—Arius endeavouring to gain friends by veiling his more offensive opinions, while Alexander dispersed warnings against him, and withstood all the intercessions of the historian Eusebius, and of others who attempted to mediate.^u

Among these was another Eusebius, an old fellow-pupil of Arius in the school of Lucian, and now bishop of Nicomedia, who procured from a Bithynian synod a recognition of his friend as orthodox, and received him when dislodged from Palestine through the influence of Alexander.^x At Nicomedia the heresiarch composed his "*Thalia*"—a book chiefly consisting of verses, and

ⁿ Philost. i. 3.

^o Tillem. vi. 242; Walch, ii. 393-5.

^p Soc. i. 5; Theodoret, i. 2; Tillem. vi. 245; Gibbon, ii. 201; Newman on Arianism, 255; Dorner, i. 812; Kaye, 3-4. Möhler attempts to reconcile the accounts by supposing that Arius for some time spread his doctrines privately; that Alexander, having heard of them, spoke in refutation of them, and that then Arius publicly contradicted him. 'Athanasius der Grosse,' i. 191-2.

^q Walch, iv. 509.

^r Soz. i. 15; Pagi, iii. 396-7; Tillem. vi. 219-221.

^s Soc. i. 6; Soz. i. 15; Schröckh, xii. 87-8.

^t Epiphanius (lxix. 3) says 700—which is, of course, incredible. See Bp. Kaye, 16-7.

^u Epiph. lxix. 4; Soc. i. 6; Soz. i. 15; Theod. i. 4-5.

^x Tillem. vi. 223; Walch, ii. 446.

described by his opponents as an imitation of a heathen versifier, named Sotades, whose writings are said to have been alike disgusting in subject and contemptible in execution.^y The *Thalia* was intended to advance the Arian doctrine by introducing it as an accompaniment of meals; and with a like view Arius wrote songs for millers, sailors, and travellers.^z The character of his mind, as exhibited in his heresy and in the arguments for it, forbids us to suppose that these productions had anything of poetry except the form.^a

Constantine, on becoming master of the East, found the Church distracted by the newly-risen controversy. In the hope
A.D. 324. of allaying this he wrote a letter to Alexander and Arius jointly—telling them that belief in a Providence was the one essential doctrine of Christianity, while he reproved them for contending about idle questions and imaginary differences, and recommended peace and unity, which, he said, they might learn even from the manner in which the heathen philosophers conducted their disputes.^b This document has been highly extolled, as a model of wisdom and moderation, but would better deserve the praise if the Godhead of the Redeemer were, in a Christian view, that utterly trifling matter which the emperor then supposed it to be.^c Armed with the imperial letter, Hosius, bishop of Cordova, to whom the settlement of the affair was committed,^d proceeded to Alexandria, and held a synod; but, although he succeeded in healing the schism of Colluthus,^e the only result as to the Arian question was to convince him that the Arians were impracticable. The dissensions occasioned by the controversy had by this time

^y Athan. de Synodis, 15, p. 728 (where specimens of the *Thalia* are given); de Sentent. Dionys. 6; Soc. i. 9; Soz. i. 21; Newman on Athan. Orat. 94–5. On the inconsistency of such a book with the alleged severity of the author's character, see Möhler, i. 186; Newman on Athan. Orat. 186. Perhaps some of Dr. Newman's own later works may serve by way of illustration, in addition to the parallel which Dean Milman (ii. 435) points out in Mr. Rowland Hill's adaptation of hymns to secular tunes.

^z Philostorg. ii. 2.

^a Neander, iv. 11.

^b Euseb. V. C. ii. 63–71. The letter was written from Nicomedia, and is generally supposed to have been prompted by the bishop of that city (Tillem. Emp. iv. 212; Mem. vi. 228; Newman on Arianism, 281). Schröckh

(v. 324) and Dean Milman (ii. 437) think that Eusebius would have shown more interest in the Arian cause, and they ascribe the letter to the influence of Hosius. (Comp. Walch, ii. 459.) But this opinion seems questionable, since, however strongly Eusebius may have felt, he could not, perhaps, have at the time served Arianism more effectually than by suggesting a policy of indifference.

^c See Möhler, i. 224; Newman on Arianism, 268. Against some of Dr. Newman's remarks, see Bp. Kaye, 25–6.

^d Soz. i. 16. Baronius (318. 59, 88–9) says that he was sent by the bishop of Rome—an assertion which is refuted by Pagi, iii. 652–5, and is not even noticed by Möhler, i. 223.

^e Walch, iv. 510.

become very serious; the disputes of the Christians were ridiculed in the heathen theatres; and in some places the emperor's statues were treated with indignity.^f

Constantine now took a new view of the affair. He began to understand that the doctrine at stake was of the highest and most essential importance;^g and, moreover, the Arians appeared to him as disturbers of the public peace. In answer to a letter from their leader he made a vehement attack on him, even condescending to pun on his name, and to ridicule his personal appearance.^h And, in order to a settlement of the controversy, and of the disputes as to the time of Easter, which had been lately revived, he summoned a general council of the whole Church, to be held at Nicæa, in Bithynia.ⁱ It was the first time that such an assemblage had been possible; for never until now had the East and the West been united under a sovereign professing the Christian faith: and the summons necessarily proceeded from the imperial authority, as being the only authority which was acknowledged by all the Christians of the empire.^k

Something has been said in a former chapter as to the manner in which the Christian doctrines on such subjects as that which was now to be discussed had gradually been defined and exhibited.^l In the earlier time, down to the age of Irenæus, the Godhead of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost had been strongly held; so strongly, indeed, that the language of the Fathers might have been misconstrued into something like Sabellianism. When heresies of that character had appeared, from the time of Praxeas downwards, they had been met by declarations which tended to establish the distinction of the Divine Persons, with a subordination of the Second and the Third as ministering to the First. The task appointed for the fourth century was to reconcile and to combine the truths which had thus been successively brought into prominence.^m

The terms by which the relations of the Divine Being had been expressed were intended to be regarded as supplementary to each other in conveying such a shadow of the mystery as is within the compass of human thought and language; and, if taken singly,

^f Euseb. ii. 61; Soc. i. 6; Theod. i. 6.

^g Newman on Arianism, 269.

^h It is preserved by Gelasius of Cyzicum, in his history of the Nicene Council, b. iii (Hard. i. 451); but he wrongly puts it after the Council. See Broglie, i. 388.

ⁱ Euseb. V. C. iii. 6.

^k Planck, i. 680-1; Newman, 259. Mr. Harris Cowper gives a letter which professes to be Constantine's citation, from the Syriac version. 'Analecta Nicæna,' 21, 29 (Lond. 1857).

^l Sup. pp. 81-2.

^m Neander, iv. 14; Newman, 104-7; 170; Dorner, i. 897-8.

they were liable to be misunderstood. Thus, the term *Son*, while it expressed the sameness of nature and the derivation of "God from God," was defective, inasmuch as it suggested ideas of posteriority, inferiority, material generation, and too great personal distinctness. On the other hand, the term *Word* or *Reason*ⁿ conveyed the ideas of coëternity, essential indwelling, and mediation, but tended to obscure that of personality—rather suggesting that the Second was to the First as an attribute or a mode of operation.^o On the incompleteness of such images Arius founded his heresy. His original objection against Alexander was, that, if the Son were begotten, the Father was anterior to Him; therefore the Son had a beginning; "once He was not."^p He could not (it was argued) have been taken from the Father's substance; therefore He was made out of nothing.^q And thus, by a sophism drawn from the title of *Son*, Arius concluded against the very doctrine which that term was expressly intended to convey—the identity of nature between the Second Person and the First.^r The Word, he said, was created by the Father, at his own will, before the worlds—before all time. He was the highest of creatures—"a creature, yet not as one of the creatures"—and therefore styled *Only-begotten*.^s He was framed after the pattern of the indwelling Divine Logos or Wisdom, enlightened by it, and called by its name.^t But although the Arians exhausted language in expressing the height of the Son's elevation, they yet, by representing Him as a creature, removed Him to an infinite distance from the Supreme Source of Being. They assigned Him a part like that of the Gnostic Demiurge in the work of creation; God (they said) created by Him, because the Divinity itself could not come into contact with the finite world. According to them, He was employed in creation as an *instrument*, whereas in Catholic language the Father was said to have wrought by Him as by a *hand*.^u It was said that He was styled God in an inferior sense—as men also are so styled in Scripture. The texts in which He

ⁿ Λόγος, Logos.

^o Athan. de Synod. 41-2; Orat. ii. 33; ad Serap. iv. 6; Hilar. de Trin. ii. 8, 15; vii. 11, 14, seqq.; Newman, 183-7; and notes on Athan. ll. cc. Kaye, 195.

^p ἦν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν. Arius would not say that there was a *time* when he was not; he held that the Son was begotten before time was. Athanasius (Orat. i. 11-15) treats this as an evasion and an absurdity. See Neander, iv. 4; Newman, 222, 227; Dorner, i. 814.

^q Thalia, ap. Athan. Orat. i. 5, 9; Soc. i. 5; Kaye, 153-5.

^r Newman, 223-4. See Athan. Orat. iii. 6; Petav. de Trin. V. iv. 6; vii. 6-8.

^s Ar. ap. Athan. de Synodis, 16. See Petav. de Trin. vi. 8.

^t Thalia, ap. Athan. Orat. i. 5; Kaye, 153.

^u Athan. de Dec. Nic. Syn. 7-8; Orat. ii. 24, p. 492; Newman, n. on Athan. Orat. 12; Kaye, 192-3.

speaks of his unity with the Father were explained as signifying either a mere agreement of will, or an indwelling of God in Him after the same manner as in men.^x

The peculiar weapon of Arius was logic; his mind was incapable of any speculation which rose into a higher region.^y The details of his system are obscured, partly by the variations to which he resorted as the consequences of his principles were pressed on him; partly by his own recoil from results which he had not foreseen or understood; and partly by his wish to disguise his opinions in such terms as might seem most plausible to the orthodox, and might be most likely to win for him the sympathy of the undiscerning.^z Among the doctrines which he once held and afterwards retracted was that of the mutability of the Son's will. He might, it was said, have fallen like Satan; the Father, foreseeing that He would not fall, anticipated the reward of his merits by bestowing on Him the titles of Son and Logos, which He was afterwards to earn.^a

The Incarnation, according to Arius, was merely the assumption by the Son of a human body—his nature supplying the place of a soul. Hence scriptural expressions, which really relate to the Saviour's humanity, were applied to his pre-existent nature, and it was argued from them that that nature was inferior to the Divine.^b

The First General Council met at Nicæa in June, 325.^c The number of bishops present was about three hundred;^d and with them were many of the lower clergy. Even some heathen philosophers were attracted to the place of assembly, and held conferences and disputes with the bishops.^e

^x Athan. Orat. i. 6; iii. 10; Möhler, i. 195-7, 201; Neander, iv. 5-8; Dorner, i. 819.

^y Dorner, i. 823.

^z Ib. 819, 823, 828; Newman, 245.

^a Thalia, ap. Athan. Orat. i. 5; Soc. i. 9; Newman, 222. This idea of desert in a creature, as the Son was said to be, contains the germ of Pelagianism. Möhler, i. 199; Dorner, i. 824.

^b Epiphan. lxi. 49; Petav. de Incarn. I. v. 4-8; Möhler, i. 198, 211-2; Neander, iv. 7.

^c Pagi in Baron, iv. 85.

^d Eusebius says 250 (V. C. iii. 8); Athanasius (De Decr. Nic. Syn. 3) and Socrates (i. 8) "more than 300;" Sozomen, "about 320." (i. 17). The Syriac list is followed by the remark that they "are in all 220, because the names of the western bishops were not written"

(Cowper's 'Anal. Nicæna,' 27, 34). The number 318, which is given by Athanasius (ad Afros, 2), Epiphanius (lxi. 11), and Theodoret (i. 7), has been traditionally accepted, with a mystical reference to the number of Abraham's servants (Gen. xiv. 14). See Tillen. vi. 805-6; Newman, n. on Ath. Hist. Tracts, 43; Gieseler, I. ii. 48; Kaye, 28-9.

^e A story is told of a simple bishop, who, by repeating his creed, converted a philosopher. (Soz. i. 18.) The writer adds another, which recalls to mind the feats of "electro-biology"—that Alexander, bishop of Byzantium, being challenged by a philosopher to dispute, and feeling himself stronger in faith than in power of argument, said to his opponent—"In the name of Jesus Christ, I command thee not to speak!" and

The controversy had not yet begun to agitate the west; and from that portion of the empire there were only Hosius of Cordova, Cæcilian of Carthage, and two Roman presbyters, Vito and Vincent, sent as representatives of their bishop, Sylvester, whose age prevented his attendance. One bishop came from Scythia, and one from Persia; the great body were from the eastern division of the empire.^f Among those who were thus assembled there was, no doubt, much variety as to their amount of ability and knowledge;^g but the object of their meeting was not one which required any high intellectual qualifications. The more subtle arguments and definitions were not introduced into the controversy until a later time.^h The Fathers who assembled at Nicæa were not called to reason, but to witness to the belief which the Church had held on the disputed subjects. It has been supposed by some writers that Eustathius of Antioch was president; others suppose that the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch presided by turns; and Eusebius of Cæsarea has also been named. The most general opinion assigns the presidency to Hosius, whose name is first among the subscriptions; but there is no ground whatever for the idea that the office belonged to him in the character of a Roman legate, or that he held that character in any way.ⁱ

The number of bishops favourable to Arius is variously stated at 13, 17, and 22;^k the most eminent among them were the two Eusebiuses,—who, however, did not agree in doctrine, as the bishop of Nicomedia went the full length of the heresy, while the historian's opinions appear to have been of the class afterwards styled *semi-Arian*.^l In the earlier sessions, which appear to have been

that thereupon the philosopher was unable to utter a word. For Constantine's conversation with Acesius, the Novatianist bishop, see above, p. 121.

^f Euseb. iii. 7; Soz. i. 17.

^g Kaye, 30.

^h Möhler, i. 227; Dorner, i. 833; Pusey on the Councils, 107-8. See Athan. de Synod. Arim. 107-5.

ⁱ The first trace of such ideas is in Gelasius of Cyzicum, a writer of little authority, towards the end of the fifth century. (l. ii. c. 5, ap. Hard. i. 376.) The bolder Romanists, as Baronius, tell us that Sylvester summoned the Council, and that Hosius presided as his legate. Their arguments are such as these:—that, as the Council *was* summoned, it *must* have been by the pope; that the pope *cannot but have* appointed a president; that whoever were present as his representatives *must* have presided, &c.

Pagi states that Constantine convoked the Council, “sed autoritate præsidii, non regiminis;” that the power belongs to popes, but was with their consent exercised by emperors. (See Baron. 325. 19; Pagi, iv. 90-103; Broglie, ii. 20, 44.) The Gallicans in general say that the summons proceeded from Constantine's sole authority, and that there is no ground for the Roman theory. (Tillem. vi. 635-7, 807-8; Dupin, ii. 318.) For the part of Roman legates in Councils, see de Marca, l. vii.

^k Newman, 270.

^l On Eusebius of Cæsarea, see Dorner, i. 792-805. He says that Romanists (as Petav. de Trin. I. xi.-xii.) generally make him a heretic—being interested in so doing, not only because his historical works expose the groundlessness of the papal claims, but on account of his op-

held in a church, Arius was repeatedly heard by the Fathers. He avowed his heresy without disguise, and it is said that the avowal caused all who were present to stop their ears. His chief opponents in argument were Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra, and Athanasius, archdeacon of Alexandria, who was in attendance on Alexander.^m

About a fortnight after the opening of the Council, Constantine arrived at Nicæa, and the sittings were transferred to the palace,ⁿ where the emperor attended, and acted as a moderator. The Arians attempted to shelter themselves under ambiguous terms.^o Eusebius of Cæsarea offered for acceptance a creed of orthodox appearance, but which artfully evaded the very questions which it was the business of the Council to determine. He censured the terms proposed by the Catholics, as not being scriptural;—a futile objection, inasmuch as the matter in dispute was the sense of those Scriptures which all professed to accept; and somewhat shameless, as coming from a party which had opened the controversy by the introduction of terms unknown to Scripture.^p In order to meet the evasions of this creed, the word *Homoöusion* (ὁμοούσιον, *of the same substance or essence*) was proposed.^q Objections were taken to it, as tending to suggest the notion of materiality—as obscuring the personal distinction—as having been connected with some heretical systems, and, in particular, as having been condemned (although in another sense) by the Council which deposed Paul of Samosata.^r Eusebius, however, acknowledged that it had been used by fathers of good repute, and at length he agreed to adopt it.^s A creed was drawn up, resembling that of Eusebius, and, like it, mainly derived

position to images (see below, c. VI. v. 11); that Anglicans acquit him; while modern Germans take a mixed view of his character. Prof. Dorner considers that Eusebius varied in his opinions, and is “a mirror of the unsolved ecclesiastical problems of his age” (p. 793). Dr. Newman (281-2) thinks that his writings do not contain enough to convict him of heresy, but that “his acts are his confession.” “The opinions of Eusebius,” says Bishop Kaye, “may be collected from B. i. c. 2, of his ‘Ecclesiastical History;’ they appear to have been in accordance with those of the Ante-Nicene fathers, who held that the Word *existed* with the Father from eternity, being personally distinct, but that He was *begotten* in order to create the world,” 44-5.

^m Soc. i. 8; Soz. i. 17; Tillem. vi. 650, 653, viii. 6.

ⁿ See Euseb. iii. 10; Till. vi. 650;

Pagi, iv. 102-4; Milman, ii. 440; Broglie, ii. 27.

^o Athan. ad Afros, 5; Theod. i. 8.

^p Neand. iv. 21; Newman, 157, 250.

^q Athan. de Decr. Nic. Syn. 19 seqq. “The word essence,” says Bishop Kaye, “appears to me better to express the meaning of the word *οὐσία* than substance. By the *essence* of a thing, I understand that by which it is what it is.”—42.

^r See p. 132.

^s Athan. ad Afros, 6; Soc. i. 8; Philostorgius is represented as saying that the Arians deceived the Council by substituting *homoiousion* (*of like substance*) for *homoöusion*; and the story is generally rejected (Tillem. vi. 659-660; Newman, 275). But his words (τὸ ὁμοιούτιον ἐν τῇ τοῦ ὁμοούσιου φωνῇ ὑποκλέψαντες, l. i. c. 9) seem rather to mean that they concealed their heretical opinion under the orthodox term.

from the older forms of the Eastern Church, but differing from it by the addition of the necessary safeguards against the Arian errors; and this creed, with a solemn condemnation of Arius, was generally signed by the bishops—among the rest by Eusebius, whose adhesion, as explained in a letter to his flock, was more creditable to his ingenuity than to his candour. The learned and courtly historian professed to have accepted the word *Homoöusion* as meaning that the Son was like the Father, and unlike all the other creatures; and to have joined in the condemnation of Arius because the censured terms were novel and unscriptural, but without intending either to pronounce the opinions in question false, or to affirm that they were held by the accused.^t The Paschal question was settled by a decision against the quartodeciman practice.^u Canons were passed on various subjects connected with the government and discipline of the Church; and the deliberations of the Council were succeeded by the celebration of Constantine's Vicennalia, during which he entertained the bishops at a splendid banquet, and, after having exhorted them to cultivate peace among themselves, dismissed them with a request that they would pray for him.^x

The Emperor followed up the Council's judgment by banishing Arius into Illyria, and including in the sentence two Egyptians, Secundus and Theonas, who were the only bishops that had throughout adhered to the heresiarch.^y Severe penalties were denounced against Arius and his followers; it was even made a capital offence to possess his writings; and Constantine ordered that the party should be styled *Porphyrians*, a name derived from that of the latest noted pagan controversialist,^z and intended to brand the Arians as enemies of the Christian faith.^a Three months after the Council, Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Nicæa, who had subscribed the creed but not the anathema, were condemned by a local synod on some new charge; and the emperor, who had given orders for their trial, sentenced them to banishment.^b

^t Euseb. ap. Athan. de Decr. Nic. pp. 238, seqq.; Soc. i. 8; Soz. i. 20-1; Theod. i. 12; Möhler, i. 235; Neand. iv. 25; Kaye, 39-41.

^u Constant. ap. Euseb. iii. 18; Soc. i. 9; Theod. i. 10.

^x Euseb. iii. 14-21.

^y There is some difference of statement here. See Soz. i. 20; Soc. i. 8; Theod. i. 7; Nat. Alex. vii. Dissert. 16; Pagi, iv. 123; Möhler, i. 233; Kaye,

45-6; Broglie, ii. 44.

^z Porphyry died in 305 or 306. Smith's Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biography.

^a Soc. i. 8; Soz. i. 21-4; Tillem. vi. 661-2, 813. Bayle remarks on the inconsistency of putting people to death for having the books of a person whose own punishment was only exile. Art. *Arius*, n. A.

^b Philost. i. 10; Soc. i. 9; Soz. i. 21; Kaye, 39. Their offence is supposed to

Within a few months after his return from Nicæa, Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, died. Athanasius, whom he had recommended for his successor in the see, was then absent,—having, it would seem, intentionally prolonged his absence on a mission to the court from a wish to avoid the dangerous and laborious dignity.^c He was, however, chosen by general acclamation; and, although some faint charges of irregularity were afterwards brought against the manner of his appointment, it would seem to have been really beyond exception.^d From the age of thirty to that of seventy-six Athanasius held the see, devoting his life to the assertion of the orthodox doctrine, which for him was no merely speculative opinion, but was intimately connected with the whole Christian life.^e To his abilities and constancy is due, under Providence, the preservation of the Eastern Church, and, perhaps, even of the whole Church, from an adoption of the Arian heresy, or from a vague and creedless system, which would probably have issued in an utter abandonment of Christianity. He displays in his writings a manly and direct eloquence; a remarkable and unusual combination of subtlety with breadth of mind; extreme acuteness in argument, yet at the same time a superiority to mere contentiousness about words. His unbending steadiness of purpose was combined with a rare skill in dealing with men; he knew when to give way, as well as when to make a show of resistance. His activity, his readiness, his foresight, his wonderful escapes and adventures, gave countenance to the stories of magical art which circulated among his enemies, and to the belief of his admirers that he possessed the gifts of miracles and prophecy. Throughout all his troubles he was supported by the attachment of his people, and of the hundred bishops who owned allegiance to the see of Alexandria.^f

The Arian party in no long time began to gain strength in the imperial court. Constantia, the widow of Licinius and sister of Constantine—a princess who had been under the influence of

have been that of communicating with Arius (Tillem. vi. 268, 743-4, 810-12; Vales. n. in Sozom.; Walch, ii. 483). Constantine, in a letter written on the occasion, reflects severely on Eusebius for his former connexion with Licinius. Theodor. i. 20.

^c Soc. i. 15; Pagi, iv. 164; Tillem. vi. 234-7, 736; viii. 7; Möhler, ii. 1-2; Broglie, ii. 287-9. Athanasius says that his predecessor died within five months after the Council of Nicæa (Apol. c. Arianos, 59), and the date has usually

been placed in 326. But the ancient Index to "Festal Letters of St. Athanasius," lately recovered in a Syriac version, places it in April, 328. See the Oxford translation, 1853, pp. x. xv.

^d Athan. Apol. c. Arianos, 6; Newman, n. on Ath. Tracts, 22; Gibbon, ii. 218; Schröckh, xii. 109-110; Neand. vi. 418; Kaye, 62-3.

^e Neand. iv. 30; Villemain, Eloquence Chrétienne, 96.

^f Gibbon, ii. 217-8; Comp. Hooker, V. xlii. 2.

Eusebius of Nicomedia—was persuaded by a presbyter, whose name is unknown, that Arius had been misrepresented and unjustly condemned.^g When on her death-bed she endeavoured to impress her brother with the same belief, and recommended the presbyter to him; and by this man the emperor, whose apprehension of the question had never been independent or discerning, was prevailed on to invite Arius to his court. The heresiarch appeared, with Euzoius, a deacon of Alexandria, who had been included in his excommunication. They produced a creed, which, although defective in the critical points, was expressed in inoffensive, and for the most part Scriptural terms; and Constantine was satisfied of their orthodoxy. Eusebius and Theognis also soon obtained a recall, protesting that they had no sympathy with the errors imputed to Arius; that their only offence had been that of doubting whether he held these errors—a doubt, they said, which the emperor himself had lately justified.^h

The Arian or Eusebian party had now full possession of court influence, and they made an unscrupulous use of it to eject such Catholic bishops as stood in their way.ⁱ Among these was Eustathius, bishop of Antioch, who had offended them by charging Eusebius of Cæsarea with unfaithfulness to the Nicene doctrine. Eusebius retorted by an accusation of Sabellianism—an error which the Arianizers habitually imputed to their orthodox opponents; and at a party synod, held in his own city, Eustathius was deposed on charges of heresy and adultery, both alike unfounded.^k The attachment of his flock, which threatened a disturbance of the public peace, aroused the emperor's jealousy, and Eustathius^l was sent into exile. After two Arian bishops had held the see for a short time, Eusebius was solicited to accept it; he declined, however, and his refusal was approved by the emperor.^m

The occupant of the other great eastern see was far more obnoxious, not only on account of his formidable character and

^g The Arians said that she was warned of this in a vision or dream. Soz. iii. 19.

^h Soc. i. 14, 26; Soz. ii. 16, 27. Tillemont (vi. 269, 744) and Walch (ii. 487) question the genuineness of the letter, and suppose that the two bishops were recalled before Arius, whose recall they place in 330. But later writers in general admit the letter. Schröckh, v. 372; Neander, iv. 28-9; Möhler, ii. 3-4; Kaye, 54-7.

ⁱ Tillem. vi. 274, 279-281; Möhler, ii. 6; Newman, 376-8.

^k Philostorg. ii. 7; Soc. i. 23; Theod.

i. 21. Pagi dates this in 327 (iv. 195); Clinton (ii. 549) in 328; Tillemont (v. 274) and Schröckh (v. 377) in 331.

^l Some place his death soon after his banishment; others as late as 360 (Schröckh, v. 378). Socrates (iv. 14) and Sozomen (vi. 13) even say that he was recalled by Jovian (A.D. 363-4), and was living at Antioch in 370. But this is generally supposed to be a mistake. See Vales. n. in Socr. iv. 14.

^m Euseb. iii. 59-62; Soc. i. 24; Soz. ii. 18-19; Tillem. vi. 276-8, 746; vii. 29; Kaye, 59-61.

talents, but as being the bishop of that Church from which Arius had been expelled, and through which it was desired by his partisans that he should be formally readmitted to Catholic communion. After Eusebius of Nicomedia had in vain attempted to mediate, the emperor himself was persuaded to write to Athanasius, requiring him to receive Arius with his followers, and threatening deposition and banishment in case of refusal. But the undaunted bishop replied that he could not acknowledge persons who had been condemned by a decree of the whole Church, and Constantine desisted from urging the matter.ⁿ

The Arians now made overtures to the Meletians. The Council of Nicæa had endeavoured to provide for the healing of the Meletian schism by an arrangement as to the possession of sees which had both Catholic and Meletian bishops;^o but Meletius, although he for a time acquiesced in the measure, had afterwards been prevailed on to continue the breach by ordaining one John to succeed him as the chief bishop of his community. The Meletians, in their enmity against the Alexandrian primate, were easily induced to lend themselves as tools to his Arian opponents; and, although hitherto free from doctrinal error, they gradually became infected with the heresy of their new allies.^p In the alleged grievances of the Meletians the Arians found means of besieging the emperor with a multitude of complaints against Athanasius; but the bishop exposed the futility of these so successfully, as even for the time to turn Constantine's indignation against the authors.^q

In 334 Athanasius was summoned to appear before a council at Cæsarea, but disregarded the citation, on the ground that he could not expect justice at the hands of such a tribunal.^r In the following year he was cited before another council, to be A.D. 335. held at Tyre; and as the order was then enforced by the imperial authority, with threats of personal violence, he thought it well to comply. Sixty bishops were present, and a lay commissioner of the emperor directed and overawed their proceedings.^s Athanasius appeared at the head of fifty Egyptian bishops, and was about to take the place to which the dignity of his see entitled him, when he was ordered by the president, Eusebius of Cæsarea, to stand as a person under accusation. On this one of the Egyptian bishops,

ⁿ Athan. Apol. 59; Soc. i. 23, 27; Tillem. vi. 231; vii. 17; Kaye, 62.

^o See Con. viii. with Routh's note; Soc. Eccl. epist. i. 416; Soc. i. 9.

^p Athan. Apol. 59; Soc. i. 27; Soz. ii. 18-9; Epiphan. lxvi. 5-6. Walch

(iv. 395) makes as little as possible of their Arianizing.

^q Athan. Apol. 60; Soz. ii. 22; Kaye, 63-4.

^r Soz. ii. 25; Theod. i. 28.

^s Planck, i. 685-6.

Potammon, a man of high repute for sanctity, addressed Eusebius: "Do *you* sit," he asked, "while the innocent Athanasius is tried before you? Remember how you were my fellow-prisoner in the persecution. *I* lost an eye for the truth; by what compliances was it that *you* came off unhurt?" Eusebius, it is said, evaded the question. "Your behaviour," he answered, "gives countenance to the charges against your party; for if you try to play the tyrants here, no doubt you must do so much more at home." And he broke up the meeting for the day.^t

Athanasius was arraigned on a variety of charges, some of them arising out of collisions with the remaining adherents of Meletius and Colluthus, in the course of the visitations which he indefatigably performed throughout his vast province. The most serious was, that he had killed a Meletian bishop named Arsenius, had cut off one of his hands, and had used it for magical purposes; and a human hand was exhibited in evidence of these crimes. Athanasius defended himself boldly and triumphantly. The story as to Arsenius was refuted by producing the man himself, alive and unmutilated,—the friends of Athanasius having succeeded in discovering him, notwithstanding the endeavours of the opposite party to keep him concealed.^u

As the case against Athanasius had thus broken down, a commission, chosen from among his bitterest enemies, was sent into the Mareotis to collect fresh evidence against him. He protested against its composition; and, without waiting for the result of its inquiries, he embarked for Constantinople, threw himself in the emperor's way as he was riding near the city, and, reminding him of the judgment at which they must both one day appear, extorted from him a promise of a new investigation in the imperial presence.^x Constantine was in so far moved by this appeal that he wrote in a tone of reproof to the council, which had already decreed the deposition and excommunication of Athanasius, and, having removed to Jerusalem for the purpose of dedicating the magnificent church of the Holy Sepulchre, had there admitted Arius and Euzoios to communion.^y

^t Epiph. lxviii. 7; cf. Athan. Apol. 8. Schröckh (xii. 121) and Valois question the truth of the imputation on Eusebius.

^u Athan. Apol. 8-12, 63 seqq.; Soc. i. 27; Soz. ii. 23-5. The affair of Arsenius had before been investigated by the emperor's brother Dalmatius; but, if so, it is hard to understand how the Arians could have ventured to revive it

at Tyre. See, however, Tillem. viii. 24, 45, 658, 663. Dupin, ii. 36. Bp. Kaye says (66-7) that the emperor seems to have varied in his opinion on the matter. Comp. Broglie, ii. 331.

^x Athan. Apol. 13 seqq.; 71-86; Soc. i. 31-4; Tillem. vi. 289; viii. 57-66; Kaye, 68-9.

^y Ath. Apol. 86; Soc. i. 34; Soz. ii. 25, 29; Tillem. viii. 59.

The leaders of the Arian faction persuaded the other bishops to return to their homes, and themselves repaired to Constantinople. Dropping the charges on which they had condemned Athanasius, they asserted that he had threatened to stop the sailing of the Egyptian fleet, on which the new capital depended for its supplies of corn. The accusation was one likely to rouse Constantine's jealousy; for on a similar suspicion he had a few years before put to death a philosopher named Sopater, who had long enjoyed his intimacy; and the artifice of the Arians was successful. Whether from belief of the charge, from a wish to remove so influential a man from a scene where he might be dangerous, or with a view of withdrawing him for a time from exposure to the malice of his enemies, the emperor banished Athanasius to Treves, where the champion of orthodoxy found an honourable reception at the court of the younger Constantine.²

But the spirit of its bishop continued to animate the Alexandrian Church. The attempts of Arius to obtain re-admission were steadily repelled; and at length reports of disturbances occasioned by his proceedings induced the emperor to summon him to Constantinople.³ A council which was sitting there condemned Marcellus of Ancyra, one of Athanasius' most A.D. 336. conspicuous partizans, on a charge of Sabellianism, to which he had at least given countenance by the use of incautious language;^b and it is said that the same council ordered the admission of Arius to communion.^c He appeared before the emperor, and without hesitation subscribed a profession of orthodoxy,^d declaring that he had never held any other doctrine. Constantine was satisfied, and, sending for the bishop, Alexander, told him that Arius must be

² Athan. Apol. 9, 87; Soc. i. 35; Tillem. vi. 290; viii. 62-5; Gibbon, ii. 223; Möhler, ii. 20; Rettberg, i. 186-7; Kaye, 74-6.

^a Soc. i. 37.

^b On Marcellus, see Soc. i. 36; Soz. ii. 32; Baron. 336. 34; Petav. de Trin. i. 13; Pagi, iv. 431; Tillem. vii. 504-6; Walch, iii. 239-41, 260, 282-294; Schröckh, vi. 174, seqq.; Neander, iv. 51-2; vi. 418-9, 427-430; Gieseler, I. ii. 55; Hagenbach, i. 254; Newman on Arianism, 334; n. on Athan. Tracts, 52; Kaye, 80. Möhler (ii. 22-35) defends him against Eusebius. It seems most likely that at first he was guilty only of injudicious language, but that afterwards he ran into more serious error. The words declaring the eter-

nity of Christ's kingdom are supposed by some writers to have been added to the Nicene Creed in opposition to one of his tenets. Petav. de Inc. XII. xviii. 5; Neander, vi. 429. See Walch, iii. 280.

^c Walch (ii. 499) says that this cannot be proved.

^d Athan. de Morte Aarii, 2 (p. 341); ad Episc. Æg. et Lib. 18. Walch (ii. 499) says that it cannot be known what the form was. That it was the Nicene Creed is denied by Tillemont (vi. 296), Neander (iv. 37), and Newman (288). The story told by Socrates (i. 38)—that Arius signed the Nicene Creed, while he secretly meant another which he carried under his arm—may pretty safely be rejected.

received into communion on the following day, which was Sunday. Alexander, who had occupied the see of Byzantium while it was as yet an undistinguished city,^e and had now almost completed a hundred years, had already been threatened by Eusebius of Nicomedia with deposition in case of a refusal, and had been for a week engaged with his flock in solemn deprecation of the intended evil. On leaving the emperor's presence, he entered the church of Peace, prostrated himself under the holy table, and prayed that, rather than he should witness such a profanation, either he himself or the heresiarch might be taken from the world. On the evening of the same day Arius was parading the streets of the city amidst a large party of his adherents, talking lightly and in a triumphant tone of the ceremonies appointed for the morrow, when the pressure of a natural necessity compelled him to withdraw.^f He was soon after found dead, and his end is related with circumstances which recall to mind that of the traitor Judas.^g

^e Broglie, ii. 357.

^f Ath. Tracts, 212; Soc. i. 37; Tillem. vi. 294-6; vii. 35.

^g (Acts i. 18.) Athan. de Morte Arij, 3; Soc. i. 38; Epiphan. lxviii. 5; lxi. 10; Theodoret, Hæres. iv. 1. Alexander's prayer is reported by some writers with admiration; by others, with horror. Perhaps it might be less difficult to defend the charity of the petition as to Arius than the faith of that as to himself. Gibbon says that "those who press the literal narrative of the death of Arius must make their option between *poison* and *miracle*" (ii. 212). The Roman Catholic writers, with Joseph Milner (i. 535) and Dr. Newman—in his Anglican work on Arianism (289), as well as in his transitional Essay on Miracles (171-4)—take the latter alternative; Mosheim (i. 396) the former. It is, indeed, very probable, as Walch (ii. 506) suggests, that the "literal narrative" may have been embellished from the story of Judas; but, without going into that question, the necessity of the choice to which Gibbon would limit us is not apparent. The possibility of poison is, as Walch (ii. 509) and Neander (iv. 40) remark, excluded by the fact that the Arians at the time ascribed their leader's death to magical arts (Soz. ii. 29). As to miracle—while the opposite party naturally looked on the event as an awful judgment on the heresy and perjury of Arius (see Athan. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib. 19), it does not appear that we need refer it to a different class from the other sudden

deaths which are among the frequent dispensations of Providence. [In this view I have the satisfaction of finding that Bp. Kaye (whose work was published after this note had been originally written) agrees. "There is," he says, "nothing in the circumstance which, if we make due allowance for exaggeration, may not be accounted for by natural causes. It was not a miraculous or preternatural interposition: but a most striking and awful event, occurring in the ordinary course of God's providential government. Athanasius speaks of it as a manifest judgment of God; but the description which he gives of it is that of a natural, though awfully sudden death," p. 79.] It ought, in justice to St. Athanasius, to be stated that his account of the heresiarch's end is free from all appearance of triumph. (See Neander, iv. 39; Möhler, ii. 48.) It is curious to compare with the view which Romish writers take of Alexander's prayers and their effect a passage in which Tillemont speaks of the Donatists—"Quand ils trouvoient quelqu'un qui s'opposoit à leur volonté . . . ils le maudissoient, ils faisoient des imprecations contre luy, et jusqu'à luy souhaiter la mort. Que s'il arrivoit ensuite quelque malheur à ces personnes, ou pour leurs pechez ou par la conduite impénétrable de la justice divine, ils se van-toient que c'estoit l'effet de leurs imprecations. Mais, voulant qu'on les cruat auteurs et causes de la mort des hommes, ils se declaroient homicides," vi. 139.

Notwithstanding the part which he had taken in the affairs of the church, Constantine had not yet been received as a member of it by baptism,^h when, in his sixty-fourth year, at a palace near Nicomedia, he was seized with a dangerous sickness. Feeling the approach of death, he sent for some bishops, to whom he declared that he had deferred his baptism from a wish to receive it in the waters of Jordan, but that, as the opportunity of doing so was denied to him, he begged them to administer the sacrament. After having been admitted by imposition of hands to the highest class of catechumens,ⁱ he was baptized by the bishop of the neighbouring city, Eusebius,^k and during the remaining days of his life he retained the white robe of baptism, refusing to wear the imperial purple. On Whitsunday, in the year 337, at noon, he expired.^l

A.D. 337.

^h Gibbon (ii. 162) represents him as having been, nevertheless, admitted to "the mysteries;" but Heinichen (*Excurs. iii.*) shows that this is improperly inferred from Euseb. iv. 22. The pagan story—that Constantine, after having put his son and his wife to death, embraced Christianity on finding that the Christian clergy offered him that absolution which paganism refused (*Zosim. ii. 29*)—is a palpable falsehood. He had professed a belief in the Gospel before the death of Crispus, which was in the year after the Council of Nicæa; and he was not baptized until much later (see *Sozom. i. 15*; *Schröckh, v. 81-2*; *Milman, ii. 396*). The opposite fable of his baptism by Sylvester will be mentioned hereafter in connexion with the forged Donation ascribed to the emperor (*Book III. c. ix. sect. 1*). Niebuhr is inclined to think that Crispus had probably deserved his death; and he rejects, even more decidedly than Gibbon, the story that Fausta was put to death by her husband's order (*Vorträge, ed. Isler.*

iii. 302). On the other side see *Brogliè, ii. 106*.

ⁱ Mosheim (*De Rebus Christ. 967-9*) and Neander (*iii. 39-40*) suppose him to have been before a catechumen of a lower grade. Valois (*in loc. Euseb.*), Tillemont (*Emp. iv. 658-9*), and Schröckh (*v. 391-2*) think that he was not.

^k Hence St. Jerome, who is the only authority that names the officiating bishop (*Augusti, vii. 159*), says that Constantine was baptized into Arianism (*Chron. A.D. 340*). But Eusebius, besides that his local position recommended him as the fittest person to officiate on the occasion, did not blazon his heresy; and the emperor, notwithstanding the influence which the Arians latterly exercised over him, supposed himself to be an unswerving adherent of the Nicene faith. See *Nat. Alex. vii. Dissert. 24*; *Tillem. Emp. iv. 267*; *Gibbon, ii. 212*; *Schröckh, v. 393*; *Kaye, 76-7*.

^l Euseb. iv. 61-4.

CHAPTER II.

THE SONS OF CONSTANTINE.

A.D. 337-361.

THE first Christian emperor was succeeded by his three sons, Constantine, Constantius, and Constans. The eldest, who held the sovereignty of Gaul, Spain, and Britain, was killed in 340, in an invasion of Italy, which was part of the territory of Constans; and Constans took possession of all that had belonged to his deceased brother.^a In 350 Constans himself was put to death by Magnentius; and on the defeat of this usurper, in 353, the whole empire was reunited under Constantius, who had until then been sovereign of the East.^b

Constantine, it is said, intrusted his testament to the same Arian presbyter who had exerted so important an influence on the religious policy of his last years;^c and by him it was delivered to Constantius, who happened to be nearer than either of his brothers to the place of their father's death. By this service the presbyter obtained free entrance to the palace; and in no long time the Arian doctrine had been embraced by the emperor, the empress, the ladies of her court, and the eunuchs^d—a class of persons so important during this reign as to justify the sarcasm of a heathen historian, who described the emperor's relation to them by saying that he had considerable interest with their chief.^e Constantius is characterised as chaste, temperate, and of strict life, but vain and weak, a slave to restless suspicion, and unrelenting in his enmity to those whom he suspected.^f His interference in the affairs of the church was alike injudicious and unfortunate. Although, like his father, he remained unbaptized until shortly before his death, he pretended to the character of a theologian; his vanity and his ignorance laid him open to the arts in which the leaders of Arianism were skilled; and throughout his reign the empire was incess-

^a Gibbon, ii. 88.^b Ib. 98-100.^d Rufin. Hist. Eccl. i. 11; Soc. ii. 2;^c P. 208. Philostorgius says that the testament was given to Eusebius of Nicomedia, as to whom he tells a curious story.—ii. 17.

Soz. iii. 1.

^e Amm. Marcell. xviii. 4; cf. xxii. 4.^f Ammian. Marcell. xxi. 16; Tillem. Emp. iv. 467-9.

santly agitated by religious controversy. The highest questions of Christian doctrine became subjects of common talk, and excited the ignorant zeal of multitudes very imperfectly influenced by Christian principle.^g The synods were so frequent, that the public posting establishment is said to have been ruined by the continual journeyings of bishops, to whom the emperor gave the privilege of free conveyance to these assemblies.^h

Constantine had steadily resisted both the importunity of the Arians, who wished that the see of Alexandria should be filled by one of their own party, and the entreaties of the Alexandrians for the restoration of the rightful bishop, although these were supported by the authority of the hermit Antony, whom the emperor admitted to a free correspondence with him.ⁱ It is said, however, that on his death-bed he gave orders for the recall of Athanasius and other banished bishops.^k His successors, at a conference in Pannonia, agreed to restore the exiles; and Athanasius, after an absence of about two years and four months, returned to Alexandria, bearing with him a letter, in which the younger Constantine assured the Alexandrian laity that the restoration was agreeable to the late emperor's intention.^l He was received with a joyful welcome by his flock; but the Arian A.D. 338. (or Eusebian) party soon renewed its attempts against him. A rival, Pistus, who had been associated with Arius, was set up. It was represented to Constantius that Athanasius had caused disturbances of the peace; that he had sold the allowance of corn which the emperor bestowed on the Alexandrian Church, and had misappropriated the price; and, further, he was charged with irregularity in resuming his see by the warrant of secular authority alone, whereas he had been deposed by a council of bishops.^m The same charges, and the old report of the inquiry instituted by his enemies in the Mareotis,ⁿ were carried to Rome by a deputation of Eusebian clergy, but were there met by some emissaries of Athanasius, who were provided with a synodical letter from nearly a hundred Egyptian bishops, attesting his merits and his innocence.^o

In the end of 340, or in the beginning of the following year, a

^g Amm. Marcell. l. c.; Epiphan. lxi. 12; Neand. iv. 40-1.

^h Amm. Marcell. l. c.

ⁱ Soz. ii. 31.

^k Theod. i. 32; Tillem. Emp. iv. 268.

^l Athan. Apol. c. Arianos, 87; Soc. ii. 2-3; Soz. iii. 2; Theod. ii. 2; Pagi, iv. 324. Dupin (ii. 36, 58) and Valois,

in his note on Theodoret, make the exile some months more than *one* year.

^m Soc. ii. 3; Soz. iii. 9; Tillem. vi. 303-4; viii. 71-3.

ⁿ See p. 210.

^o Athan. Apol. c. Arianos, 3-19; Soz. iii. 7.

council met at Antioch for the dedication of a splendid church which had been founded by Constantine. The number of bishops is said to have been ninety-seven, of whom forty were Eusebians.^p They passed a number of canons, which have been generally received in the Church;^q one of these, in itself unexceptionable, but framed with a special design that it should become a weapon against Athanasius, enacted that, if any bishop, after having been deposed by a council, should appeal to the temporal power, instead of seeking redress from a higher council, he should forfeit all hope of restoration.^r It would seem that after a time the Eusebians became dominant in the assembly, whether through the retirement of the orthodox bishops, or through reliance on the support of Constantius, who was present.^s They renewed the charges against Athanasius, condemned him under the canon just mentioned, and, after the bishoprick of Alexandria had been refused by Eusebius, afterwards bishop of Emesa,^t consecrated to it Gregory, a Cappadocian by birth, a man of coarse and violent character.^u Gregory immediately proceeded to take possession, accompanied by a military escort, under the command of Philagrius, prefect of Egypt, who was an apostate from the faith. He entered the city in the beginning of Lent. Churches were attacked by the soldiers, with a mob of Arians, Jews, and heathens; and horrible outrages and profanations were committed, which reached their height on the solemn days of the Passion and the Resurrection. The Catholics were not only ejected from the churches, but were prevented from holding their worship in private houses. Having thus settled matters in the capital, Gregory set forth on a visitation of his province. A party of soldiers attended on him, and by his orders

^p Soc. ii. 8; Tillem. vi. 311-2.

^q Schelstrate and other Romanists have attempted to account for this by supposing that there were about the same time an Arian and an Orthodox Council at Antioch, and that the canons proceeded from the latter (see too Nat. Alex. viii. 31-3). But the reception of the council, as of that of Laodicea (A.D. 372 ?), is really to be traced to the influence of the later Nicaenes, Basil, the two Gregories, &c., who, having been in early life connected with the Semarian party, brought with them to the side of orthodoxy many of that party's traditions. Gieseler, I. ii. 67-8. See below, c. iv.

^r Can. xii.

^s Pagi, iv. 371-3; Schröckh, vi. 60, 68.

^t On Eusebius, see the edition of his

scanty extant remains published by Augusti, Elberfeld, 1829. Although styled by St. Jerome "Arianæ signifer factionis" (Chron. A.D. 351), he seems to have been really a Semarian (Augusti, 84). The Latin sermons, on the strength of which he is styled in our Homilies (p. 408, Oxf. 1832) "a godly father," are of Gallican authorship, and belong to the fifth and sixth centuries (Aug. 94). The sermon there cited is ascribed by Oudin to Faustus, bishop of Riez (see Book II. c. xiii. s. 1), and is printed in the Appendix to St. Jerome, t. xi. Ep. xxxviii. 3.

^u Soc. ii. 8-9; Soz. iii. 5; Tillem. viii. 77, 676-7. Athanasius remarks on the irregularity of appointing a stranger, and that at a distance from the see. Apol. 29, 30.

many bishops, monks, and virgins were beaten—among them the aged Potammon, who was treated with such severity that he died in consequence.^x

Athanasius, on the arrival of Gregory at Alexandria, withdrew to a retreat in the neighbourhood, and issued an address to all bishops, desiring them to join in condemnation of the intruder.^y He then betook himself to Rome, where a synod of fifty bishops pronounced him innocent, and confirmed to him the communion of the Church.^z Other expelled bishops also appeared before the council; among them was Marcellus of Ancyra, who had resumed his see on the death of Constantine, and had been again dispossessed of it, but was now able to satisfy Julius and his brethren that the charges of heresy on which he had been deprived were founded in misapprehension.^a A correspondence followed between Julius and the Eastern bishops, but without any satisfactory result, as the Eusebians, who had before proposed that the case of Athanasius should be referred to a council, evaded the execution of their own proposal when they found that the Alexandrian bishop had himself appeared at Rome.^b

The council of Antioch produced four creeds.^c As the death of Arius had released his partisans from the difficulties connected with their personal regard for him,^d they now endeavoured to give plausibility to their cause by approaching as nearly as possible to the orthodox statements, in the hope that by new formularies the Nicene creed might gradually be obscured. In their attacks on Athanasius during the reign of Constantine, they had been careful to advance charges which did not relate to doctrines, but to practical matters;^e and the same policy of avoiding the open statement of differences as to doctrine was now continued. The creeds of Antioch were therefore so composed that in ordinary circumstances they would have been received as satisfactory. The more offensive positions of Arianism were distinctly condemned; the council repudiated the name of Arians,—“for how,” it was asked, “should

^x Ath. *Encycl. ad Episc.* (t. i. 110-8); *Hist. Arian.* 10-13.

^y The “*Encyclica ad Episcopos Epistola*,” Mühler, ii. 61.

^z Ath. *Apol.* 1; Soz. iii. 8.

^a Ath. *Apol.* 32; Soz. iii. 8.

^b Ath. *Apol.* 20, seqq.; Soz. ii. 15-17; Soz. iii. 10. These events have been related as generally as possible, and with a wish to avoid questions of chronology, which seems to be hopelessly entangled. For a statement of

the difficulties, and of various schemes which have been proposed, see Dr. Newman's Introduction to *St. Athanasius' Historical Tracts*. One point in dispute is, whether Athanasius went to Rome for the first time after the intrusion of Gregory; or whether he had already been there a year and a half, and had returned to his see a short time before Gregory's appearance.

^c Hard. i. 605-610.

^d Neand. iv. 40.

^e Kaye, 76.

we who are bishops follow a presbyter?" The dignity of the Saviour was set forth in the highest terms; the studious omission of the word *homoousios* (*coessential*) alone excited suspicion as to the orthodoxy of the framers.^f Of these formularies, the second (which claimed an older author, the martyr Lucian) was that which afterwards became distinguished as "The Creed of the Dedication."

In the mean time Constantinople had been the scene of repeated disturbances. Alexander, on his deathbed, being consulted by some of his clergy as to a successor, replied that, if they wished for a man "apt to teach," and of holy life, they ought to choose

Paul; if they wanted a man of business and address,
Aug. 336.

with an appearance of piety, they should choose Macedonius, who was a presbyter of longer standing.^g Paul was elected, but was soon deprived by the Arians on various charges of irregularity in his life and in the manner of his appointment. After the death of Constantine he returned to his see, but was

compelled to make way for the translation of Eusebius
A.D. 339.

from Nicomedia, on whose death, in 342, the ejected bishop and Macedonius were set up by the opposite parties. The city was thrown into violent commotion, and Constantius sent a military force to suppress the disorder; whereupon the populace set fire to the lodgings of the commander Hermogenes, dragged him about the streets, and murdered him. The emperor, in great indignation, hastened to Constantinople, drove out Paul, and deprived the citizens of half their allowance of corn; but, regarding Macedonius as a sharer in the cause of the tumult, and being also displeased with him for having allowed himself to be consecrated without seeking the imperial permission, he did not establish him as bishop. Paul soon after returned, but having allowed himself to be decoyed into an interview by Philip, the prætorian prefect, he was seized, and privately sent away by sea, while the prefect proceeded to install Macedonius. The populace flocked together in excitement, and upwards of three thousand perished, either by being crushed to death, or by the weapons of the soldiery. From 342 to 380, with the exception of two years, the bishoprick of the eastern capital was in the hands of the Arians.^h

Constans, like his brother Constantine, adhered steadily to the cause of Athanasius. The exiled bishop, after spending three

^f Soc. ii. 10; Soz. iii. 5; Pagi, iv. 367-9; Newman on Arianism, 308; Neand. iv. 45; Kaye, 58, 90.

^g Soc. ii. 5 (who misdates the affair). Sozomen (iii. 3) says that the Arian ac-

count reversed the application of these characters. See Walch, iii. 74.

^h Soc. ii. 12, 13, 16; Soz. iii. 7, 9; Tillem. Emp. iv. 327; Mém. vi. 323-5; vii. 254-7, 697-8.

years at Rome, waited on the emperor at Milan: and at the same time there appeared a deputation of oriental bishops—bearing with them a new creed which had lately been drawn up by a council at Antioch.¹ This document, which from its length was styled *macrostiche*, was in form rather an argument than a definition; like other late creeds of the same party, it was sound in itself, but induced suspicion by avoiding the term *co-essential*. The western bishops were dissatisfied with it, partly from ignorance of Greek, and partly from a wish to adhere to the Nicene creed as sufficient.^k The emperors agreed to summon a general council,^l which was to meet at Sardica, in Illyria—a place on the borders of East and West, but within the dominions of Constans. About a hundred western and seventy-six eastern bishops attended,ⁿ and Hosius presided over the assembly—not as legate of the Roman see, but in right of his age, character, and influence.^o

The orientals at the outset protested against the admission of Athanasius, Marcellus, and other deposed bishops as members of the council. It was answered that they were not to be regarded as deposed, since the latest decisions were in their favour; that they were ready to meet all charges; and that the council might reopen the whole question from the beginning.^p But the orientals adhered to their objection, and, finding that it was decidedly resisted, they withdrew across the border of the empire to Philippopolis, in Thrace, where they held a separate synod under the presidency of Stephen, bishop of Antioch. Two eastern bishops remained at Sardica, while Ursacius, of Singidunum (Belgrade),

¹ A.D. 345. Pagi, iv. 409.

^k Ath. de Conc. Arim. et Sel. 26; Soc. ii. 19-20; Soz. iii. 10; Tillem. vi. 326, 331; viii. 90; Kaye, 95.

^l Baronius (346. 5) asserts that the council was summoned by the Pope, but is refuted by Pagi. Rohrbacher tells us that—"Il fut convoqué par l'autorité du pape S. Jules; car (!) Socrate nous apprend que quelques orientaux l'accusèrent d'avoir fixé un terme trop court" (vi. 304). Socrates, however, distinctly says that the two emperors summoned it. ii. 20.

^m Tillem. viii. 92. Mansi, on the authority of a document unknown to the earlier writers, dates the council in 344. His arguments satisfied Schröckh (vi. 78); but Gieseler (I. ii. 54) considers that they have been overthrown by Wetzer, and the old date, 347, is now generally received. See n. on Athan.

Festal Letters, 120.

ⁿ The number is variously given. The statement of many writers (as Soc. ii. 20, and Soz. iii. 20), that there were 300 of the west, is founded on misapprehension of a passage of Athanasius (Apol. 1), which gives the number, not of bishops who were present, but of those who approved the decisions of the council. It seems probable that there were 170 in all, which, if 76 were orientals, would leave 94 western bishops. Vales. in Soc. ii. 20; Tillem. viii. 681-2; Newman in Ath. Tracts, 70; Kaye, 96-7.

^o Tillem. viii. 93, 681-2. Dean Milman thinks that perhaps Julius, in absenting himself, may have been actuated by a wish not to risk the growing dignity of his see by incurring a comparison with Hosius. iii. 15.

^p Hilar., Opus Histor., Fragm. ii. 4-6; Fragm. iii. 14, seqq.; Soz. iii. 11.

Valens, of Mursa (Essek), and three other Arians of the West, took part in the council of Philippopolis.^a The western council declared the Nicene creed to be sufficient;^r the orientals drew up a fresh creed, more Arian than those of Antioch,^s and each synod passed a sentence of deposition against the most conspicuous members of the other. The western bishops also enacted a number of canons, and again pronounced Athanasius and Marcellus innocent;^t but their judgment was not of itself enough to reinstate Athanasius in his see, and he retired for a time to Naissus, in Dacia.^u

The party which enjoyed the favour of Constantius continued to occupy the sees of the East, and to exercise fresh violences against the orthodox.^x After a time, however, the emperor
A.D. 349. changed his policy—partly in consequence of a threat of war from Constans, who required the restoration of Athanasius,^a partly through disgust at the detection of an infamous plot which had been laid by Stephen, bishop of Antioch, against some envoys of the western Church;^b and he wrote thrice to Athanasius, inviting him to resume his see.^c The bishop took Antioch in his way, and there had an interview with Constantius, who begged him, as a favour, to allow one church at Alexandria to those who were not of his communion. Athanasius offered to do so, on condition that the members of his communion should receive a like indulgence at Antioch;^d but the emperor, on conferring with the Arians who had suggested his proposal, found that they were not disposed to make the exchange, as at Antioch orthodoxy was dangerously strong among the laity, whereas at Alexandria both the temper of the people and the abilities of the bishop forbade them to expect any great success.^e

Athanasius was admitted to communion by a council at Jeru-

^a Tillem. viii. 98.

^r Ath. Tom. ad Antiochenos, 5, p. 772. Socrates (ii. 20) and Sozomen (iii. 11) wrongly say that they confirmed it by another creed. Schröckh, vi. 81.

^s Hilar. Fragm. iii. 29. See Neand. iv. 47.

^t Hil. Fragm. ii. 8.

^u Sozomen, iii. 13. For the documents, see Hard. i. 637, seqq.

^x Kaye, 103.

^a Soc. ii. 22; Soz. iii. 20; Philostorg. iii. 12; Tillem. viii. 692. The fact has been doubted (as by Schröckh, vi. 94, and Neander, iv. 48-9); but Gibbon (ii. 223) considers it to be proved. Although Constans was the weaker, a threat of attack from the west might

well alarm Constantius, engaged as he was in a Persian war. Möhler, ii. 78.

^b Athan. Hist. Arian. 20-1; Theod. ii. 9-10. Stephen was deposed, and in his room was appointed Leontius, who had been a pupil of the martyr Lucian (Philost. ii. 14), and had been degraded from the presbyterate in consequence of having emasculated himself, in order that he might enjoy without suspicion the company of a young woman. Ath. Apol. de Fuga, 26; Hist. Ar. 28; Theod. ii. 24.

^c Ath. Apol. c. Ar. 51; Soc. ii. 23.

^d Socrates less probably says that he required this in every city where the Arians had the ascendancy. ii. 23.

^e Soz. iii. 20; Theod. ii. 12.

saalem, and was recommended to his flock by an imperial letter, which ordered that the record of former proceedings against him should be cancelled.^f The intruder Gregory had died, or had been killed^g a short time before; and Athanasius, on his return to Alexandria, after an exile of eight years, was received with universal rejoicing. The thankfulness of his flock was shown in bountiful works of charity, and many persons of both sexes embraced a monastic or ascetic life on the occasion.^h

His enemies felt that their power was at an end. Ursacius and Valens, the most noted supporters of Arianism in the West, went to Rome, and with a profession of regret for the part which they had been induced to take against the bishop of Alexandria, entreated a council to receive them into communion.ⁱ But the hopes of the Arians were speedily revived by the murder of Constans, although Constantius wrote to assure Athanasius that he should find from him the same support as from his brother;^k and they renewed their machinations against the Alex-^{A.D. 350.} andrian bishop by attacking his adherents in other quarters. The errors into which some of their opponents had run gave plausibility to this policy. Marcellus of Ancyra was again^{A.D. 351.} deposed—having, it would seem, developed his heterodoxy more distinctly.^l His pupil, Photinus, bishop of Sirmium, went so far as to teach palpable Sabellianism: that there was no personal distinction in the Godhead; that the Logos was nothing else than the Divine attribute of wisdom, which at length was manifested in Jesus, whom he regarded as a mere man, although supernaturally born; and that the Holy Ghost was only an influence.^m For these tenets Photinus was repeatedly condemned, and in 351 he was deposed by a synod held in his own city.ⁿ

^f Ath. Apol. 56-7; Hist. Ar. 22-4; Soc. iii. 24.

^g Theodoret (ii. 12) says that he was killed by some of his people; but W. Loth (not. in loc.) supposes that here, as elsewhere, Gregory is confounded with the later intruder, George.

^h Ath. Hist. Ar. 25; Möhler, ii. 83.

ⁱ Ath. Apol. 1, 2, 58; Hist. Ar. 26; Soc. ii. 24; Soz. iii. 23; Pagi, iv. 478; Kaye, 106. Gibbon's doubts (ii. 224) are refuted by Dean Milman in his note, by Möhler (ii. 82), and by Dr. Newman, in Ath. Tracts, 86.

^k Hist. Ar. 24.

^l Tillem. vi. 350.

^m See Epiphani. Hæres. lxxi.-ii.; Nat. Alex. viii. Diss. 30; Walch, iii. 34-8; Schröckh, vi. 187-8; Neand. iv. 95;

vi. 431; Giesel. I. ii. 55-6; Newman on Ath. Orations, 114; Hagenbach, i. 254-5. Dr. Newman (note on Ath. Orat. 502, seqq.), followed by Bp. Kaye (268-9), thinks that the so-called "Fourth Oration against the Arians" is chiefly meant against Marcellus and Photinus, although, as in the parallel case of Apollinarius (see below, c. iv.), St. Athanasius does not name his opponent. A document published by Montfaucon leads to the opinion that Marcellus shortly before his death recanted his errors, and was again acknowledged by St. Athanasius, who had excommunicated him (Hilar. Fragm. ii. 21). See Walch, iii. 254-5.

ⁿ Ath. de Conc. Arim. et Sel. 27; Pagi, iv. 478, 503; Walch, iii. 61-2;

About the same time many orthodox bishops were also ejected from their sees. Paul of Constantinople, who had recovered his

bishoprick before or soon after the council of Sardica,^o
A.D. 351. was again driven out, and was carried off to Cucusus, a savage place in the lesser Armenia, where, after having been for some time deprived of food, he was strangled.^p Macedonius was intruded into the see, and behaved with such violence—branding, fining, banishing, and even putting to death, those who were opposed to him, both in Constantinople and in other places to which his power extended,—that the emperor himself found it necessary to remonstrate with him. The Novatianists, who had retained their orthodoxy as to the doctrines impugned by Arius, were exposed to the same persecution with the Catholics; and when these were deprived of their own churches, they resorted to the three which the Novatianists possessed within the city. But, although a temporary connexion was thus established by the community of suffering, the principles of the sect prevented its permanent reconciliation with the church.^q

On the 8th of September, 351, a great battle was fought between the troops of Constantius and Magnentius near Mursa (now Essek), the episcopal city of Valens. During the engagement, Constantius was praying in a church, with the bishop at his side; and it is said that Valens, having learnt the defeat of the enemy by means of a chain of scouts, announced it as having been revealed to him by an angel.^r By this artifice, or by some other means, Valens gained an influence over the emperor's mind, and he diligently used it for the furtherance of the opinions which he had for a time pretended to disown. Constantius was assailed with a multitude of charges against Athanasius. He was persuaded that the bishop was proceeding tyrannically in Egypt and Libya against all who would not submit to him. Much was made of the fact that, on his way to Alexandria, after his late exile, he had conferred ordination in dioceses where the bishops were opposed to his views.^s It was said that he had caused the death of the younger Constantine; that he had exasperated Constans against Constantius; and—a charge which he repelled with especial horror and indignation—that he had corresponded with the murderer of Constans, the usurper Magnentius.^t

Giesel. I. ii. 55-6; Newman on Ath. (Patrol. xx.); Gibbon, ii. 96, 213.
 Orat. 160.

^o Pagi, iv. 463; Tillem. vii. 257-8.

^p Ath. Hist. Ar. 7.

^q Soc. ii. 26-7, 38; Soz. iv. 2; Tillem. vi. 397-402.

^r Sulpic. Severus, Hist. Sac. ii. 38

^s Soz. iii. 21. Such a transgression of the usual rules could only be justified by necessity. See Bingham, IV. vi. 5.

^t Ath. Apol. ad Const. 1, 2, 6, &c.; Soc. ii. 26; Soz. iii. 21, iv. 2, 11.

Liberius, who in April, 352, succeeded Julius as bishop of Rome,^u was immediately beset by complaints of the orientals against Athanasius; but a letter from an Egyptian synod determined him to disregard them as unfounded.^x The final defeat of ^{Aug. 10,} Magnentius, however, by which Constantius came into ^{353.} undisputed possession of the West, increased the power of the Alexandrian patriarch's enemies. Their object now was to procure a condemnation of him from the western bishops, who, although sound in faith, were for the most part liable to be imposed on through their ignorance of the Greek theological subtleties, and through fear of their new sovereign, by whom the matter was studiously represented as a personal question between himself and a refractory bishop.^y A synod was held at Arles, where Liberius was represented by Vincent of Capua, and another Campanian bishop. The emperor insisted on the con- ^{A.D. 353.} demnation of Athanasius. Vincent (perhaps the same person with the presbyter of that name who had appeared as a Roman legate at Nicæa^z) proposed by way of compromise that the opinions of Arius should at the same time be anathematised; but he was told that these were not then in question, and at length he yielded and subscribed. Liberius was deeply distressed on hearing of his representative's compliance. He requested the emperor to call a free council for the investigation of the case; and the Eusebians, although with very different objects, also urged the assembling of a council.^a

About three hundred western bishops, with a few from the east, met at Milan in 355. The sessions of the council were held in the palace, and its deliberations were overawed by Constantius and his soldiers. An edict of Arian purport was read, the substance of which the emperor professed to have received by revelation; and he dwelt on the success of his arms as a proof of the Divine blessing on his opinions. The attempts of some orthodox bishops to obtain an inquiry into the question of faith was met by Ursacius and Valens with a peremptory demand that they should join in the condemnation of Athanasius; and the sentence was signed by all but Eusebius of Vercelli, Lucifer of Cagliari, and Dionysius of Milan. The three recusants were banished, many

^u Baron. 352. 1; Pagi, iv. 505.

^x Lib. ap. Hilar. Fragm. v. 2. There is an improbable story that Liberius at first took part against Athanasius, and altered his policy on learning the true state of the case. See Tillem. vi. 352,

viii. 138-140, 695-6; Dupin, ii. 75-6.

^y Newman, 329; Neander, iv. 32.

^z Tillem. vi. 358.

^a Hil. Fragm. v. vi. 34; Baron. 353. 18; Tillem. vi. 357-9.

other bishops were sent into exile, and their places were filled with intruders whose heterodoxy was their only qualification for the episcopate.^b A general persecution was carried on for the purpose of enforcing conformity to the emperor's will, while the orthodox cried out that the days of Nero and of Decius had returned.^c

There were still two important persons in the West to be gained—Liberius, conspicuous for his position, and Hosius, the "Father of the Bishops,"^d who had been a confessor under Maximin, had sat in the council of Eliberis half a century before, and had been president of the councils of Nicæa and Sardica. Overtures were made to Liberius in vain; the influential chief of the eunuchs, Eusebius, was sent to Rome, for the purpose of tempting him by offers and by threats; and, as he refused to wait on the emperor, he was forcibly carried off from his city in the middle of the night. On his arrival at Milan, the bishop was admitted to several interviews with Constantius, of whom he demanded that a council unrestrained by the imperial influence should be summoned, to investigate the case of Athanasius. Constantius reproached him as being the only bishop who still adhered to the Egyptian primate—whose removal the emperor professed to regard as more important to himself than the victories which he had gained over Magentius and other pretenders to the throne. Liberius was firm; he refused the offer of three days for consideration; and, on receiving sentence of banishment to Beroëa, in Thrace,^e he indignantly rejected large sums of money which were sent to him by the emperor, the empress, and the chief of the eunuchs, as contributions towards the expenses of his journey.^f Hosius also withstood all attempts to shake his constancy, and, after having been kept under restraint a year, was banished to Sirmium.^g In the room of Liberius, the Archdeacon Felix (who, however, is said by some authorities^h to have been orthodox in faith) allowed himself to be consecrated by three foreign bishops, the chief of whom was Acacius of Cæsarea, in Palestine.ⁱ

^b Soc. ii. 36; Ath. Hist. Ar. 33-4; Eus. Vercell. Patrol. xii. 947, seqq.; Sulp. Sev. Hist. Sac. ii. 39; Hard. i. 697-700; Baron. 355. 2, seqq.; Tillem. vi. 362-3; vii. 532, seqq.; Möhler, ii. 124; Kaye, 110.

^c Hil. c. Constant. 7; Baron. 353. 17-23; Tillem. vi. 366-380; vii. 525, 544; Gibbon, ii. 226-7.

^d Athan. Hist. Ar. 42.

^e A different place from that of the

same name in Acts xvii. Tillem. vi. 768.

^f Ath. Hist. Ar. 35-7; Soz. iv. 11; Tillem. vi. 381-6; Gibbon, ii. 228.

^g Baron. 355. 61-8; Möhler, ii. 130-3.

^h As the author of the Pontificals in Murat. iii. 113, or Patrol. cxxviii. 31; Soz. ii. 7; and Theod. iv. 11.

ⁱ Soc. ii. 37; Baron. 355. 55-7; 357. 62-3; Tillem. vi. 386-7. On the question whether Felix should be recognised

The Arians now thought themselves strong enough to proceed to the ejection of Athanasius. Several attempts were made to draw him away from his see by the use of the emperor's name; but he refused to attend to anything short of a warrant as express as that which had authorized his restoration, or as the assurance of protection which Constantius had voluntarily given him after the death of Constans.^k As the emperor was reluctant to grant such a warrant (apparently out of fear that it might provoke an insurrection of the Alexandrians and a stoppage of the corn supplies on which Constantinople depended),^l another course of proceeding was adopted. Syrian, general of Egypt, who was charged to effect the removal of the bishop, lulled him and his flock into security by promising to write to the emperor A.D. 356.
January. for distinct instructions, and, about three weeks later, proceeded to execute his purpose. In the night of the 9th of February, 356, as Athanasius with many of the Alexandrians was preparing for a celebration of the Eucharist by keeping vigil in the church of St. Theonas, the general, with 5000 soldiers and a mob of Arians, surrounded the building. The bishop, hearing the noise without, calmly seated himself on his throne, and desired that the 136th Psalm should be sung—the whole congregation joining in the response “For His mercy endureth for ever.” The soldiers forced the doors, and a fearful confusion ensued. Many persons were trodden under foot, crushed to death, or pierced with javelins; the consecrated virgins were stripped and beaten; the soldiers pressed onwards to the choir, and Athanasius was urged to save himself by flight. He declared that he would not depart until his people were safe, and, rising, desired them to join in prayer and to withdraw as quickly as possible. The bishop himself was determined to remain to the last; but as the danger became more urgent, the clergy, when the greater part of the congregation had escaped, closed round him, and carried him away, exhausted and in a swoon. The soldiery and the mob continued their outrages, and the ornaments of the church were plundered or defaced. The Catholics of Alexandria addressed the emperor in a protest against the violence which had been committed; but he replied by justifying Syrian, and ordering them to discover and give up Athanasius.^m

in the Roman church as pope and martyr, there is a curious story in Schröckh, viii. 105. See too Milman, Lat. Christ. i. 65.

^k Ath. Apol. ad Const. 19-27.

^l Gibbon, ii. 229; Milman, iii. 26.

^m Ath. Apol. ad Const. 24-30; de Fuga, 24; Hist. Arian. 81; Index to Fest. Lett. xxii.; Soc. ii. 24, 28; Soz. iv. 2; Theod. ii. 13; Pagi, iv. 558-561.

In the beginning of Lent, a new Arian bishop, George, a Capadocian by birth, arrived at Alexandria. This intruder, although he was recommended in extravagant terms by imperial letters,ⁿ is described by the Catholic writers as a man who had behaved discreditably in low secular employments; rude, illiterate, and disdaining even to put on an outward show of piety.^o The reproach of gross ignorance is hardly consistent with the fact of his possessing a library so rich both in Christian and in heathen literature, that after his death it excited the interest of the emperor Julian;^p but the other charges are confirmed by the testimony of the pagan Ammianus Marcellinus; indeed George, by his exactions, became no less odious to the pagans than he was to the orthodox.^q Supported by the civil power, he raged against the Catholics of every class—bishops, clergy, monks, virgins, and laity—plundering, scourging, mutilating, banishing, and committing to the mines. Some bishops died in consequence of the cruelties which were inflicted on them. One renegade, who joined the usurper's party, submitted to reordination. After a time, George was driven out by his people, and took refuge with the emperor; but he returned with ampler powers, and made himself more detested than ever.^r

The aged Hosius, worn out by exile, imprisonment, severity, and even torture, at length gave way, and in 357 subscribed at Sirmium a heterodox creed, of which it was even pretended that he was the author; but he did not, apparently, sign the condemnation of Athanasius. By this submission he recovered his see; and he died shortly after at the age of a hundred or upwards. Athanasius, who speaks of him with tenderness and pity, states that on his deathbed he protested against the violence to which he had been subjected, and abjured the errors to which he had yielded a forced assent.^s

The fall of Liberius speedily followed that of Hosius. In April, 357, Constantius visited Rome, where no emperor had been seen since 326. A number of ladies of rank, after having in vain endeavoured to persuade their husbands to undertake the office of

ⁿ Ath. Apol. ad Const. 30.

^o Greg. Naz. Orat. xxi. 16; Baron. 356. 14; Gibbon, ii. 321; Möhler, ii. 161.

^p Julian. Epp. 9, 36.

^q Amm. Marc. xxii. 11; Epiphan. lxxvi. 1.

^r Ath. Apol. de Fuga, 6-7; Soz. iv. 10, 30; Theod. ii. 14; Newman on Ath.

Orat. 134; Kaye, 135-6.

^s Ath. Apol. c. Arian. 89; Hist. Ar. 45; Val. in Soc. iii. 31; Tillem. vi. 318-321, 417; vii. 317; Neand. iv. 65; Kaye, 114. The editor of Mariana (Madrid, 1817, t. iii. 200), in his national zeal, denies the fall of the great Spanish bishop.

intercession, waited on him with a petition for the recall of Liberius. Constantius answered that the bishop might return if he could agree with his brethren of the court party, and proposed that he and Felix should jointly govern the Church. This compromise, on being announced in the circus, was received with a derisive cry, that it would suit well with the factions into which the frequenters of that place were divided—that each of the colours might have a bishop for its head; and the whole assembly burst into a shout, “One God, one Christ, one bishop!”^t But in the following winter Liberius, weary of his Thracian exile, entreated in abject terms that he might be recalled. He professed to concur heartily with Ursacius, Valens, and their oriental partizans; he appeared even greedy of humiliation in disavowing his former opinions; and, after subscribing an Arian or Semiarian creed,^u he was allowed to return to Rome. Felix was expelled, not without bloodshed between the parties of the rival bishops, according to some accounts; and the remaining eight years of his life were spent in peaceful obscurity.^x

Arianism appeared to be everywhere triumphant; but internal differences, which had hitherto been concealed, began to show themselves openly.^y

(1.) It had been the policy of the Arians or Eusebians to veil

^t Soz. iv. 11. See Faustin. et Marcell. Præf. ad Libell. 1. (Patrol. xiii. 81); Lib. Pontif. (ib. cxxviii. 30); Milman, Lat. Christ. i. 65-6.

^u Hil. Fragm. vi. 4-10. Some Romanists, as Baronius (357. 43-53), endeavour to make it appear that the creed which he signed was the *first* Sirmian (Hard. i. 701)—the production of the synod which condemned Photinus in 351—a form which was not heretical. Tillemont (vi. 772-4), Fleury (xiii. 46), Döllinger (i. 83), and Bishop Kaye (113), incline to this opinion—Tillemont avowedly on the ground of charity, and the bishop with some misgivings. Its improbability is shown by Schröckh (vi. 138), and Neander (iv. 65). Neander says that the creed was certainly not the *first* Sirmian; that it *may* have been the *third* (Hard. i. 709), which condemned both the *homoëusion* and the *homoiousion*; but that it was most likely the second (ib. 705)—the same which Hosius had signed. Petavius holds that it was a creed different from any of those which are given by Athanasius (De Trin. I. ix. 5). Dupin (ii. 77) and Möhler (ii. 204) consider the matter doubtful. Rohrbacher (vi.

429-432, 438-9), following some earlier writers of his church (see Schröckh, vi. 139), boldly denies the pope's lapse altogether! See Newman on Ath. Orat. 161-2.

^x Soz. iv. 15; Theod. ii. 17; Faust. et Marcell. Præf. i. 2. “The adherents of Felix,” says Gibbon (ii. 237), “were inhumanly murdered in the streets, in the public places, in the baths, and even in the churches; and the face of Rome, upon the return of a Christian bishop, renewed the horrid image of the massacres of Marius and the proscriptions of Sylla.” Sozomen (iv. 11-15) and Sulpicius Severus (Hist. Sac. ii. 39), mention tumults and bloodshed *before* the restoration of Liberius; but Gibbon's statement, although made in such terms as if the matter had never been questioned, rests on no better authority than that of the Pontificals (Patrol. cxxviii. 31), which is allowed to be worthless. See Labbe, Concilia, ii. 739-740; Tillem. vi. 437-8; Bower, i. 141; Milman, Lat. Christ. i. 66.

^y Rufin. Hist. Eccl. i. 25; Tillem. vi. 411; Schröckh, vi. 140; Neander. iv. 58-9; Kaye, 123.

their heresy by abstaining from any distinct declaration on the most critical points, and putting forth professions which in themselves were sound, although short of the full Catholic belief. And now an unexpected result of this system appeared: the formulas which had been intended speciously to cover the heterodoxy of their framers had in the course of years trained up a party which honestly held them, without the errors which the more advanced Arians had been careful to keep in reserve. The Semiarians or Homoiousians^a (as they are styled) believed that the Son was “like in all things” to the Father; that his essence was *like* that of the Father—differing from it only in not being identical with it; that He was truly a Son, begotten beyond time and before all worlds.^a Eusebius of Cæsarea was the precursor of Semiarianism; but its appearance as the distinctive doctrine of a party did not take place until long after his death. There was much of respectability and piety among the Semiarians. Athanasius and Hilary speak of them as brethren—being willing to believe that they were not really heterodox, but only scrupled at the use of the word *homoöusion*, as apparently savouring of Sabellianism, and as having been condemned in Paul of Samosata. To this party—of which Basil of Ancyra and George of Laodicea were the leaders—the majority of the eastern bishops now belonged.^b

(2.) On the other hand, Arianism for the first time came forth without disguise in the doctrines of Aëtius and his pupil Eunomius.^c The former, a man of very low origin, notorious for a disputatious character, and ignorant of ecclesiastical learning, was ordained deacon by Leontius of Antioch,^d and was afterwards deposed by him. His early education had been scanty; but he afterwards acquired from a philosopher of Alexandria a knowledge of geometry and dialectics, and he insisted on applying the rules of these sciences as the measure of religious truth.^e Aëtius unflinchingly carried out the principles of Arianism to their conclusions, so as to offend and annoy the more cautious of its professors, who spoke of him as “the godless.”^f He maintained that the Son, as being a creature, was necessarily unlike the Father, not only in

^a From *ὁμοούσιος*, “of like essence or substance.”

^b Newman on Arianism, 317–9.

^c Ath. de Synod. 41; Hil. de Synod. 76–91; Soz. iii. 13; iv. 19; Schröckh, vi. 109–112; Möhler, ii. 230; Newman, 318–20; n. on Ath. Orat. 17, 63, 103, 129, 138; Kaye, 108, 132. Athanasius argues strongly against scrupling at

terms when the belief is the same. De Synod. 33–4, 54—in the latter place, with reference to the Semiarians.

^d Basil. c. Eunom. i. 1.

^e Philostorg. iii. 15, 17. This writer, being himself an Anomæan, extols Aëtius.

^f Epiphan. lxxvi. 2.

^g Ib. 3.

substance but in will;^g hence his party were called *Anomœans*.^h Eunomius, who attained to the bishoprick of Cyzicum,ⁱ went still further in the same direction. Although he professed to refer to Scripture, his system was not founded on it, but was merely a work of reasoning. It was purely intellectual, excluding all reference to the affections. He discarded the idea of mystery in religion; he held that God knows no more of his own nature than man may know of it; that the Son resembles the Father in nothing but his working; that the Holy Spirit was created by the Son. He denied all sacramental influences, and—unlike Arius, who was himself a man of rigid life—he opposed everything like asceticism.^k

(3.) Between the Anomœans and the Semiarians stood the crafty, secular, and unscrupulous party which was now called after Acacius, the successor of Eusebius in the see of Cæsarea.^l Agreeing in principles with the Anomœans, they by turns favoured them when it was safe, and disavowed them when it would have been inconvenient to show them countenance; and for a time they endeavoured to conceal the difference between themselves and the Semiarians as to the essence (*οὐσία*) of the Son by proscribing the term as unscriptural and as having been the source of trouble to the Church.^m The emperor's own opinions were Semiarian; but the policy of Acacius and the personal influence of Valens counterbalanced his doctrinal convictions.ⁿ

Leontius, who had been appointed bishop of Antioch on the deprivation of Stephen in 349,^o and had endeavoured to preserve peace in his church by an equivocating policy,^p died in the end of

^g Epiphan. 2; Soc. ii. 35; Soz. iv. 12; Theod. ii. 24; Newman, 360-1; n. on Ath. Orat. 3, 11; Kaye, 130.

^h From *ἀνόμοιος*, unlike.

ⁱ Philost. v. 3.

^k Eunom. ap. Basil. adv. Eunom. i. 23; ii. 1, 32-3; Philostorg. vi. 1; viii. 18 (where Eunomius is celebrated for the clearness of his teaching); Theodoret. Hær. iv. 3, p. 227; Epiph. lxxvi. 4; Philastrius adv. Hæreses, 68 (Patrol. xii. 7; Soc. iv. 7; Schröckh, vi. 122-132; Neand. iv. 50; vi. 420; Newman, 363. The Anomœan views were combated by both the Gregories, as well as by Basil (Greg. Naz. Orat. 27-31; Greg. Nyss. tt. i. iii.). The Eunomians are said to have been the first to introduce single instead of trine immersion in

baptism. They had some strange baptismal rites, and rebaptised converts not only from Catholicism, but from other forms of Arianism. Soz. vi. 26; Philostorg. x. 4; Epiph. lxxvi. p. 992; Theod. Hær. iv. 3, p. 236.

^l Epiph. lxxiii. 27; Kaye, 108.

^m See the second creed of Sirmium in Hil. de Synodis, 11; Neand. iv. 64-5. Acacius said that the Son was "like" the Father—not "like in substance." Newman on Ath. Orat. 7.

ⁿ Petav. de Trin. I. xii. 1-3; Newman, 359; Giesel. I. ii. 58.

^o See p. 220.

^p In illustration of this we are told that in the Doxology, where the Arians chanted "Glory be to the Father, by the Son, in the Holy Ghost," while the

357. On being informed of his death, Eudoxius, bishop of Germanicia, who was in attendance on the emperor in the West, requested leave to go into Syria under false pretences, and got possession of the vacant see. The favour which the new bishop

openly showed to Aëtius provoked the Semiarians to A.D. 358. hold a council at Ancyra, where they condemned the Anomœan doctrine and the second creed of Sirmium;^a and their decisions were ratified by the emperor, who, at their desire, resolved to summon a general council for the final settlement of the questions which had so long distracted the Church.^r On this the Acacians took the alarm, and, fearing that both Catholics and Semiarians might unite to condemn them, they fell on the expedient of dividing the council, in the hope that they might be able to manage its separate portions. Their arguments as to the difficulties and the expense of bringing bishops from all parts of his dominions to one place were successful with Constantius. It was resolved that the Western branch of the Church should be cited to Rimini, and the Eastern to Nicæa; and that ten deputies from each division should afterwards meet in the presence of the emperor.^s

About four hundred and fifty bishops assembled at Rimini in May, 359. A creed, drawn up by some Acacians and Semiarians at a previous meeting, and known as the Third Creed of Sirmium, was offered to the council by Valens and Ursacius. It proscribed the term *essence* (οὐσία) as unscriptural, and liable to misapprehension, and declared the Son to be "like the Father in all things, as the Holy Scriptures say and teach." The Acacians hoped that the Catholics would subscribe these words according to their most obvious sense, while for themselves they interpreted them as meaning *like in all things to which Scripture extends the likeness*;^t but the bishops, although for the most part unskilled in theological subtleties, were animated by a strong distrust of the party, and declared that the Nicene Creed was sufficient. Ursacius, Valens, and four others were excommunicated for refusing

Catholics adhered to the ancient form, the bishop sang in such a manner that his words could not be made out until he came to that part in which all agreed; and that, pointing to his white hairs, he used to say—"When this snow melts, there will be much mud,"—meaning that his death would be the signal for commotions. Soz. iii. 20. The second of these stories is strangely misapplied by Bp. Taylor, vol. viii. 356, ed. Eden.

^a See above, p. 227, note ^a.

^r Hil. de Synod. 12 seqq.; Soc. ii. 36; Soz. iv. 12-14; Pagi, iv. 626; Tillem. vi. 422-3; 431-3; 775; Gieseler, I. ii. 59-60; Newman on Ath. Orat. 162-3.

^s Soz. iv. 16-7; Theod. ii. 26; Neand. iv. 66-7; Newman, 366-7.

^t Ath. de Synod. 8; Newman, n. on Ath. Orat. 83, 163; Soc. ii. 36; Soz. iv. 17; Tillem. vi. 444-5; Neander, iv. 67-8; Kaye, 123. The explanation of the evasion is not uniform.

to sign it;" and twenty deputies were sent off to the emperor, with a request that no innovation on the faith might be attempted, and that the members of the council might be allowed to return to their homes. Constantius, who was on the point of setting out for the seat of the Persian war, deferred seeing the envoys until his return, on the ground that his mind was so occupied by political business as to be unfit for the due consideration of Divine things. During his absence, the representatives of the council, who were detained at Nice in Thrace, were practised on by his courtiers; and thus after a time they were drawn into signing the same creed which had been produced at Rimini, but rendered more objectionable by the omission of the words "in all things." In the mean time, their brethren at Rimini were sedulously plied with arguments from the emperor's character and intentions, from the desirableness of peace, the inexpediency of contending about (as was said) a mere question of words, the hopelessness of bringing the Orientals to adopt the term *coessential*. Valens, by way of dissipating their suspicions, uttered anathemas which seemed to be altogether irreconcilable with Arianism; and at length, pressed by solicitations, desirous to return to their homes before winter, and deluded as to the meaning of their act, they also subscribed the formula which was presented to them.^x "The whole world," says St. Jerome, "groaned, and was astonished to find itself Arian." On returning to their dioceses, the bishops began to understand the import of their submission. Many of them then repudiated the creed which they had signed, and wrote letters of sympathy to Athanasius.^y

The place of the eastern council's meeting had been transferred from Nicæa to Nicomedia; but in consequence of an earthquake by which that city was reduced to ruins, a further change became necessary, and Seleucia, the capital of Isauria, was eventually fixed on.^z The whole number of bishops who attended was about a hundred and sixty, of whom a hundred and five were Semi-arians, thirty-five Acacians, and the rest orthodox.^a The last of

^u Hilar. Fragm. vii. 3-4; Soc. ii. 36; Soz. iv. 17.

^x Athan. ad Afros, 3; Hilar. Fragm. vii.-ix; Soc. ii. 36-7; Soz. iv. 19; Tillem. vi. 456; Schröckh, vi. 149-153; Möhler, ii. 211-2; Newman, 373-4; Kaye, 126-131.

^y Hieron. c. Lucif. 18, 19; Hil. Fragm. xi. xii. 2-3. Liberius, who was not pre-

sent at the council, is said to have recovered himself by a strenuous opposition to its creed. Baron. 359. 46-8; Tillem. vi. 464.

^z Philostorg. iv. 10; Newman, n. on Ath. Orat. 73.

^a Hil. ad Const. 12; Soc. ii. 39; Soz. iv. 22; Tillem. vi. 466-7; Newman, 368, and n. on Ath. Orat. 88. The

these parties was composed of Egyptians, together with Hilary, bishop of Poitiers, one of the most powerful champions of the Catholic faith, who had been banished into Phrygia in the year

356, and was now summoned to take part in the deliberations of his Eastern brethren.^b The Acacians, finding themselves outnumbered, attempted under various pretences to break up the assembly; and the dissensions which arose were so violent that the imperial commissary, Leonas, found himself obliged to dissolve it. The majority signed the "Creed of the Dedication;"^c the Acacians condemned both *homoöusion* (of the same essence) and *homoiousion* (of like essence) as inexpedient, and anathematized the term *anomoion* (unlike).^d Both Semiarians and Acacians sent off deputies to the court; and although Constantius agreed in opinion with the former, and the council had been convened for the purpose of establishing their ascendancy, the Acacians were the first to reach him, and succeeded in winning his ear.^e A council was held at Constantinople in the emperor's presence, where each party preferred charges against its opponents. Aëtius was deposed from the diaconate, being given up by the Acacians as a scapegoat, while, on the other hand, Basil of Ancyra and other Semiarians were deposed and banished as insubordinate.^f It was ordered that the Creed of Rimini should be signed everywhere, and all who refused compliance were treated with severity.^g

Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople, had rendered himself obnoxious to the Acacian party by showing an inclination towards the Semiarians.^h It was therefore resolved to get rid of him; and

in order to his removal, advantage was taken of the emperor's displeasure, which had been justly excited by the bishop's violent proceedings,ⁱ and was now swelled by a new offence. As the church in which the body of the great Constantine had been deposited—hastily and unsubstantially erected, like the buildings of the new capital in general^k—was already likely to fall, Macedonius removed the coffin to another church; and

general proportions are alike in the several accounts, although with differences of detail

^b Schröckh, xii. 61, 308; Neand. iv. 53-4; Möhler, ii. 134-5.

^c See above, p. 218.

^d Hard. i. 724; Soc. ii. 39-40; Tillem. vi. 492-3. Hilary says that they did this on finding that "men's ears could not endure words of such impiety" as *anomoion*. See c. Constant. 14.

^e Hil. c. Const. 15; Schröckh, vi. 164; Neand. iv. 70.

^f Hard. i. 724-8; Soz. iv. 24; Theod. ii. 27. For the later history of Aëtius and Eunomius see Philostorg. iv. 12; v. 3; vii. 6, etc.

^g Greg. Naz. Orat. xxi. 23-4; Kaye, 130-1.

^h Philostorg. iv. 9.

ⁱ See p. 222.

^k Zosim. ii. 32; Hope on Architecture, 113.

Constantius was irritated, both by his presuming to take such a step without the imperial permission, and because the factions of Constantinople had made the removal the occasion for a serious disturbance.¹ The bishop was therefore deposed on various charges of misconduct (for the Acacians, out of fear lest the emperor's sympathy should be excited, were careful to avoid the question of doctrine in their proceedings against the Semiarians); and Eudoxius of Antioch was appointed his successor,^m while the bishoprick of Antioch was bestowed by a council on Meletius, formerly bishop of Sebaste, a man of high reputation, who had until then been reckoned among the Arian party.ⁿ Meletius, it is said, on taking possession of his new see, at first confined his preaching to practical subjects; but when he had thus obtained some hold on his flock, he began openly to teach the Nicene doctrine.^o For this the council, which was still sitting,^p deposed and banished him within thirty days after his installation, and in his room appointed Euzoius, formerly a deacon of Alexandria, who had been the associate of Arius in the early stages of the heresy.^q Ever since the deprivation of Eustathius, an orthodox party had been kept up within the church of Antioch, notwithstanding the Arianism of the bishops. This party now formed a separate communion, which regarded Meletius as its head; but the old Eustathians, who had throughout stood aloof, refused to communicate with them, on the ground that Meletius had received his appointment from Arians, and that his followers had been baptized in heresy.^r A.D. 361.

The council of Antioch set forth an undisguisedly Anomœan creed, declaring the Son to have been created out of nothing, and to be unlike the Father both in substance and in will.^s St. Athanasius reckons this as the eleventh creed to which the variations of Arianism had given birth;^t Tillemont makes it the eighteenth.^u Amidst such a continual manufacture of new

¹ Soc. ii. 38; Soz. iv. 21.

^m Soc. ii. 42-3.

ⁿ Epiph. lxxiii. 35; Soz. iv. 28; Tillem. vi. 517-9. It is a high testimony to the character of Meletius, that neither his orthodox nor his Arian opponents ever bring any moral imputation against him. Walch, iv. 429.

^o Soc. ii. 44. Theodoret (ii. 31) tells the story differently, and its truth is questioned by Tillemont (viii. 346 and note). See Epiph. lxxiii. 28; Philostorg. v. 5; Walch, iv. 432-3; Möhler, ii. 216; Kaye, 139.

^p Pagi, v. 12-13, says that there were two councils within a very short time; that Constantius was not at that which appointed Meletius, but probably at that which deposed him.

^q See p. 208; Walch, iv. 435-8.

^r Soc. ii. 44. According to some writers, Eustathius was still alive. See above, p. 208.

^s Soc. ii. 45.

^t De Synodis, 23-31.

^u Tillem. vi. 521-2. See Petav. de Trin. i. 9; Kaye, 132-5.

standards of doctrine, it was no wonder that the heathens derided the Christians as having still to learn in what their faith consisted.*

The reign of Constantius was now near its end. The Cæsar Julian had been proclaimed Augustus by his troops in Gaul, and had advanced far towards the Eastern capital. Constantius set out to meet him, but was arrested by illness at Mopsucrenæ, in Cilicia, where he died on the 3rd of November, 361, at the age of forty-four, and in the twenty-fifth year of his reign. A short time before his death,—but whether at Antioch or at Mopsucrenæ is uncertain,—he was baptized by the Arian bishop of Antioch.^y

* Ath. de Synodis, 2.

Pasch. A.D. 361; Tillem. Emp. iv.

^y Ib. 31; Philostorg. vi. 5; Chron. 465-6, 691.

CHAPTER III.

JULIAN.

A.D. 361-363.

I. IMMEDIATELY after the death of the great Constantine, the soldiery at Constantinople committed a massacre among the princes of his house. With the exception of his ^{A.D. 337.} three sons—of whom two were at a distance, while Constantius was even supposed to have instigated the murderers.^a—the only survivors of the imperial family were two children of the late emperor's half-brother, Julius Constantius, who himself was one of the victims. Gallus was spared because his sickly constitution seemed to preclude the apprehension of future danger from him; Julian, who was only six years of age, is said to have been saved and concealed in a church by Mark, bishop of Arethusa.^b

The early education of these brothers was superintended by Eusebius of Nicomedia, who was distantly related to them.^c When Julian had reached the age of fifteen, they were ^{A.D. 346.} removed to Macellæ, near Cæsarea in Cappadocia. They lived in the palace of the old Cappadocian kings, and were treated in a manner suitable to their rank, yet were kept in a seclusion which had the nature of imprisonment. They were trained in a strict routine of religious observances; they were even admitted into the order of *readers*, and officiated in the service of the Church.^d After having spent five years in this manner, Gallus was appointed Cæsar, and was established at ^{A.D. 351.} Antioch. Julian was allowed to study at Constantinople, but, as the popularity which he gained there excited the emperor's

^a Socrates (ii. 5) says that Constantius did not give the order, but also did not prevent the massacre. See Tillem. Emp. iv. 314; Gibbon, ii. 78, 103. Beugnot (i. 131-6) thinks that it was an outbreak of paganism. Niebuhr (Vortr. ed. Isler, iii. 303) says that we are in the dark as to the matter, and that Constantius, who was obnoxious both to Catholics and to pagans, has probably been too unfavourably represented.

^b Greg. Naz. Orat. iv. 91; Soc. iii. 1; Soz. v. 1; Gibbon, ii. 103, 316. Julian was born Nov. 6, 331 or 332. Gibbon, ii. 270.

^c Amm. Marc. xxii. 9.

^d Julian. ad Athenienses, p. 271, ed. Spanheim, Lips. 1696; Greg. Naz. Orat. iv. 23; Soz. v. 1; Gibbon, ii. 285-6. Gregory of Nazianzum highly extols Constantius for his kindness towards the young princes, 22, 35, seqq.

jealousy, he was soon ordered to Nicomedia, where he endeavoured to disarm the suspicions of Constantius by shaving his head and living like a monk.^e After having displayed both violence and incapacity in his new elevation, Gallus was removed from his government, and was put to death, by order of Constantius, in the end of 354.^f At the same time Julian was summoned from Ionia to the court at Milan, where he was detained in a state of suspense for seven months; he then, through the influence of the empress Eusebia, who steadily befriended him,^g obtained leave to attend the schools of Athens.^h

The Persians on the east, and the barbarian nations on the north, obliged Constantius to seek for assistance in the government of the empire. Julian was therefore declared Cæsar in November, 355. He received in marriage the hand of the emperor's sister Helena, and at the suggestion of Eusebia, who represented him as a harmless, studious youth, who would either bring credit to the emperor by success, or would deliver him from alarm by meeting with death,ⁱ he was sent to undertake the government of Gaul. Although his life had hitherto been that of a student, he soon distinguished himself by his ability both in war and in civil administration.^k But his relations with Constantius were of no friendly kind: the emperor openly decried and ridiculed him, thwarted and crippled him in his administration, and assumed the credit of his victories.^l The army murmured because its commander was not furnished with the means of bestowing the usual donatives;^m and this discontent was at length swollen to a height by an order which Julian received when in winter-quarters at Paris,ⁿ in April, 360. On being informed that he was required to despatch the strength of his troops to the Persian frontier, the soldiers rose in mutiny; and, notwithstanding a show of resistance which was perhaps not wholly sincere, the Cæsar was hailed as Augustus, was raised aloft on a buckler, and was crowned with a circlet formed of the chain by which the standard-bearers^o of the legions were distinguished.^p Eusebia and

^e Soz. v. 1.

^f Amm. Marcell. xiv. 1, 7, 11.

^g Jul. ad Athen. pp. 273-6. But she opposed his elevation to the Cæsarship.

Amm. Marc. xv. 8.

^h Amm. Marc. xiv. 2.

ⁱ Zosim. iii. 1.

^k Ib. xvi. 1, seqq.; Gibbon, ii. 110-3.

^l Jul. ad Athen. pp. 277-283; Amm. Marc. xvii. 9-10; Gibbon, 129-130, 251.

Niebuhr, however, refers the measures

of jealousy to court intrigues, of which he supposes Constantius probably innocent. Vortr. iii. 307.

^m Amm. Marc. xvii. 9.

ⁿ For a description of Paris, see Jul. Misopogon, p. 340. Zosimus styles it a *πολίχνη* of Germany. iii. 9.

^o "Draconarius." See Ducange, s. v.

^p Amm. Marc. xx. 4-5; Niebuhr, iii. 308.

Helena, whose mediation might have prevented a breach between the imperial kinsmen, were both lately dead. Julian's proposals for a division of the empire were scornfully rejected; and, after fruitless negotiation, he resolved to march against Constantius.^q Carrying out a brilliant conception with an energy which triumphed over all difficulties, he penetrated through the Black Forest to the Danube, embarked his army on the great river, and landed at a point within a few miles of Sirmium.^r He had already become master of almost all the West, when the death of Constantius saved the empire from the miseries of a civil war.

Nov. 3,
361.

The policy of Constantius towards Paganism was, on the whole, a continuation of his father's. Laws are found which forbid sacrifice and idolatry even on pain of death;^s and under Julian the pagan orators complained of severities exercised against their religion in the late reign.^t It is, however, certain that the more rigorous laws, even if they were actually published at the time, were not generally acted on.^u Paganism was still largely cherished, especially among the aristocracy of the older capital, among the philosophical and literary class, and among the peasantry.^v Its rites appear to have been freely practised, even by persons in authority.^x The first Christian emperor was, like his predecessors, enrolled among the gods. Constantius retained the style of Pontifex Maximus; on his visit to Rome, in 357, he respected the old religion, and even made appointments to priestly offices;^y and, although he was unintermitting in his hostility to the arts of astrology and divination, it was on account of their dangerous political character.^z Some temples were given up for Christian purposes, or were bestowed on favourites of the court; but there were enactments against destroying any, and against defacing heathen monuments.^a The doctrinal controversies of the time diverted the attention of the Christians from paganism, and,

^q Zosim. iii. 9.

^r Jul. ad Ath. 284-6; Amm. Marc. xx. 8; xxi. 9-15; Gibbon, ii. 251-266.

^s Cod. Theodos. XVI. x. 4, 6.

^t Soz. iii. 17; Pagi in Baron. iv. 401; Schröckh, vi. 8-10; Beugnot, i. 145.

^u Gibbon, ii. 246-7; Beugnot, i. 141-2.

^v Beugnot, i. 151. The name of *pagan*, which I have sometimes used by way of anticipation, began probably to be applied in a religious sense about this time, when the strength of the old religion was in the *pagi* or villages. The

first legal use of it is by Valentinian I. A.D. 368. Cod. Theod. XVI. ii. 18; Gothofr. in Cod. Theod. t. iv. 250; Ducange, s. v. *paganus*; Gibbon, ii. 248.

^y See the inscriptions in Beugnot, i. 152-4.

^z Symmachus, ap. Ambros. ii. 968; Beugnot, i. 164; Gieseler, I. ii. 11.

^a Cod. Theod. IX. xvi. 4-6; Pagi, iv. 557; Beugnot, i. 142-3.

^x Cod. Theod. IX. xvii. 1-4; XVI. x. 3; Baron. 340. 45; Beugnot, i. 136-8, 142.

moreover, rendered each party unwilling to provoke the multitude which was without the Church.^b It was in vain that some of the more intemperate Christian writers, among whom Firmicus Maternus^c is the most noted, attempted to urge the government to more vigorous measures for the suppression of idolatry.^d

Before setting out on his expedition, Julian, although he had but lately celebrated the Christian festival of the Epiphany,^e declared himself a votary of the "Immortal Gods," propitiated them with sacrifices, and claimed their assistance for his arms.^f It is not difficult to understand the motives of this defection, on account of which the epithet *Apostate* has become the usual accompaniment of his name. His Christian training, with its formal and constrained devotion, had been so conducted that it could hardly have failed to alienate a mind like his—quick, curious, restless, and vain. His desire of knowledge had been thwarted in its direction; in his earlier years he had been forbidden to seek instruction from the heathens who were most celebrated as professors of rhetoric;^g and the prohibition had lent a charm to their opinions. Filled with an enthusiastic admiration for the heroes and sages of heathenism, he was unable to understand the dignity of Christian meekness and endurance;^h and, moreover, he had come to estimate the system in which he was educated by the imperfections of those around him, while heathenism appeared to him in ideal brightness, as embodied in the lives of its worthies—as connected with literature, philosophy, and art.ⁱ The eyes of the pagans had early been fixed on him as the hope of their religion. He was courted by philosophers and rhetoricians, and in all his changes of residence he was handed over by one of them to another. They not only entangled his mind in their speculations, but practised on it by the proscribed arts of theurgy and divination, flattering him with the idea of one day becoming master of the empire. At Ephesus, in his twentieth year, he was formally initiated into paganism by Maximus, a philosopher who had gained a powerful influence over him; and during his stay at Athens he was admitted to the Eleusinian mysteries. But the

^b Gibbon, ii. 248; Schröckh, vi. 9; Gieseler, I. ii. 10, 316.
Neander, iii. 44–5.

^c See, for example, his work 'De Errore profanarum Religionum,' cc. 17, 29, 30. Nothing is known of his life; Bp. Münter dates the work about 348. Patrol. xii. 974.

^d Neander, iii. 48–9; Beugnot, i. 148;

^e Amm. Marc. xxii. 1.

^f Jul. ad Athen. pp 286–7; Gibbon, ii. 261.

^g Liban. Orat. x. t. ii. 263.

^h Greg. Naz. Orat. 71–2; Neander's Julian, transl. by Cox, 61.

ⁱ Cyrill. Alex. adv. Jul. cc. vi.–vii.

secret of his apostacy was carefully kept until his assumption of the imperial title rendered a longer hypocrisy needless.^k

Julian arrived at Constantinople on the 11th of December, 361, and left it in the middle of the following May. He reached Antioch in the end of June, 362, and remained there until March 5, 363, when he set out on his fatal expedition into Persia.¹ Thus the greater part of his short reign was spent in two cities especially unfavourable to his religion; for Constantinople had never until his time been polluted by public sacrifice, and at Antioch—although the inhabitants were too commonly licentious, luxurious, and fond of frivolous diversions^m—Christianity was generally professed, so that there were only a few aged people who remembered the days when paganism was the national creed.ⁿ

Julian's paganism was very unlike the old political religion of Rome; it was eclectic, philosophical, enthusiastic, and more akin to Gnosticism than even to the Greek system.^o He believed in one supreme God, whom he identified with the Mithra or Sun-god of Oriental worship. Under this deity he acknowledged others—the tutelaries of nations, sciences, and the like. He believed the world to be eternal, and from the diversity of national character he argued against the common origin of mankind.^p The worship of images was defended on philosophical grounds, very remote from the popular belief.^q The convert's zeal for the old religion far outstripped that of its hereditary professors. A pagan historian of the time describes him as rather superstitious than properly religious;^r and his heathen subjects in general looked with surprise and disrespect on the profusion of his costly sacrifices, and on the share which he himself took in them—performing even the coarsest and most repulsive functions.^s In other respects, too, his vanity displayed itself in an ostentatious disregard of the

^k Amm. Marc. xix. 2; Greg. Naz. Orat. iv. 31, 43-4; Soc. iii. 1; Gibbon, ii. 291-4; Niebuhr, ed. Isler, iii. 306, 309; Neand. iii. 50-7, vi. 371-2.

¹ Gibbon, ii. 269, 337; Clinton.

^m See Julian's 'Misopogon,' *passim*; Zosim. iii. 11.

ⁿ Niebuhr, ed. Isler, iii. 311. The emperor, after having restored the temple of Daphne, near Antioch, which had been converted into a church of St. Babylas (Chrys. t. ii. Hom. de S. Babyla, i. 2; ii. 14 seqq.), repaired to it on the day of a great local festival, but found in attendance, only a single

priest, with no other sacrifice than a goose. Misopog. 362.

^o Beugnot, i. 215; Niebuhr, iii. 310.

^p Jul. Orat. iv.; ap. Cyrill. pp. 116, 143, &c.

^q Julian, pp. 92, 294-5.

^r "Superstitiosus potius quam sacrorum legitimus observator, innumeras sine parcimonia pecudes mactans; ut æstimaretur, si revertisset de Parthis, boves jam defuturos." Amm. Marcell. xxv. 4.

^s Ib. xxii. 12-3; Gibbon, ii. 297; Beugnot, i. 196-7.

form and dignity which are usually associated with sovereign power. In his appearance and habits he affected a cynical roughness, which drew on him the satire of the wits of Antioch; and he condescended to reply to their jests and ballads by a book in defence of his beard.^t He reformed the luxury of the court with an unwise and precipitate severity; he disbanded the host of eunuchs and parasites who had been attached to it during the late reign, and replaced them by philosophers and professors of divination, many of whom proved unable to bear with equanimity the honours and employments which were bestowed on them.^u

The religious policy of the last two reigns was now reversed. The immunities and endowments which had been conferred on the clergy were transferred to the heathen priesthood; but, whereas Constantine, in restoring church-property to the rightful owners after the persecution, had indemnified the existing holders at the expense of the state,^x Julian ordered that Christians who had been concerned in the destruction of temples should rebuild them at their own expense, and that money received from property which had formerly belonged to the pagan religious establishment should be refunded. Even if the means of such restitution had been in their hands, the restoration of temples (which would in many cases have involved the demolition of churches erected on their sites) was intolerable to the consciences of the Christians; and in consequence of the edict many of the clergy were subjected to tortures, imprisonment, and death.^y The case of Mark, bishop of Arethusa, is especially noted. "The magistrates," says Gibbon, "required the full value of a temple which had been destroyed; but, as they were satisfied of his poverty, they desired only to bend his inflexible spirit to the promise of the slightest compensation. They apprehended the aged prelate, they inhumanly scourged him, they tore his beard; and his naked body, anointed with honey, was suspended in a net between heaven and earth, and exposed to the stings of insects and the rays of a Syrian sun. From this lofty station Mark still persisted to glory in his crime, and to insult the impotent rage of his persecutors. He was at length rescued from their hands; Julian spared his life; but if the bishop of Arethusa had saved the

^t The 'Misopogon.' See Jul. pp. 338, seqq. 364.

^u Jul. ad Athen. pp. 273-4; Amm. Marc. xxii. 3-4; Soc. iii. 1; Soz. v. 3; Gibbon, ii. 273-4, 335; Milman, iii. 78-9, 104. Gregory of Nazianzum can find nothing to commend in him, except

that, after having invited many of his old Asiatic acquaintances to his court, he disappointed the hopes of greatness which they conceived. Orat. v. 20.

^x See p. 151.

^y Soz. v. 5; Philostorg. vii. 4; Neand. iii. 66.

infancy of Julian, posterity will condemn the ingratitude, instead of praising the clemency, of the emperor."²

Julian knew from the experience of former times that the employment of force against Christianity, far from suppressing it, had a contrary effect. He was unwilling to indulge the Christians and to animate their zeal by martyrdom; he was unwilling to sully his own reputation by harsh measures; he wished to gain credit by a display of toleration which might contrast with the persecutions of Constantius.^a The stories of martyrdoms which are referred to this reign are probably for the most part fabulous; and, although much of oppression and outrage was committed against the Christians,^b it does not appear that the emperor was directly concerned in such acts. It is, too, very evident that the Christians sometimes provoked the ruling party by needlessly offensive conduct, and that their complaints are not always free from exaggeration.^c But, although Julian declared that argument and persuasion were the only means to be employed for the furtherance of his opinions, he allowed proceedings of a very different kind. He refused justice to the Christians with a shameless partiality, and made the refusal offensive by sarcasm. Thus when the Arian bishop George was murdered by the pagans of Alexandria, he took no further notice of the deed than by very slightly reproving them.^d In consequence of a disturbance between the orthodox and the Valentinians of Edessa, he seized on the property of the Edessan church, and distributed it among his soldiers—telling the Christians that their wealth would no longer be a hindrance to their attaining the kingdom of heaven.^e When Christians appealed to him against the illegal violence of governors or of mobs, he reminded them that their religion enjoined on them the duty of patience under wrong. He deprived them of civil and military employments, and excluded them from the courts of law; and he alleged as his reason, that the Gospel forbids worldly ambition, bloodshed, and lawsuits.^f Although he professed to consider the devotion of the heart essential in religion,^g he sometimes used artifices in order to obtain some merely outward, and

^a Gibbon, ii. 316; Greg. Naz. Orat. iv. 88-91; Soz. v. 5, 10; Theod. iii. 7.

^b Jul. Epp. 7, 43, 52; Greg. Naz. Orat. iv. 57-8, 61; Rufinus, H. E. i. 32; Soz. v. 4. M. de Beugnot's attempt to show that the changes effected or contemplated by Julian were comparatively slight, appears unsuccessful.

^c Greg. Naz. Orat. iv. 86, seqq.; v.

29; Philostorg. vii. 1-4.

^d See Soc. iii. 15; Gibbon, ii. 327-8; Gieseler, I. ii. 20.

^e Ep. 10; Ann. Marc. xxii. 11.

^f Ep. 43.

^g Greg. Naz. Orat. iv. 96-7; Soc. iii. 2, 13-14; Gibbon, ii. 315, 320, 323; Niebuhr, iii. 310.

^h Ep. 52, p. 436.

even unconscious, acts of homage to the heathen gods; thus he surrounded his own picture with pagan figures and emblems, so that the usual obeisance to it should involve an appearance of idolatry.^h In like manner, on the occasion of a donative, he required his soldiers to cast a few grains of incense into the fire—representing the act as merely an old custom, without any explanation of the import which he attached to it.ⁱ

By a strange exercise of tyranny, Julian issued an edict that no "Galilean"—for thus he required by law that the Christians should be styled^j—should become a professor of classical literature. By way of giving a reason for this order, he declared that the Greek language belonged to his own party,^k and denounced the immorality and covetousness of persons who taught a system which they themselves did not believe;^l but, as it seems incredible that the emperor could have seriously confounded the religion with the literature of Greece, other motives have been conjectured—such as jealousy of the eminence which some Christian rhetoricians had acquired, and a wish to deprive the Christians of the controversial advantages which they might derive from an acquaintance with the absurdities of pagan mythology.^m Some Christians endeavoured to evade the edict by clothing the Scripture history in the forms of Greek composition—epic, drama, and Platonic dialogue; and these they substituted for the forbidden textbooks.ⁿ It has been said that Julian went so far as to prohibit "Galileans" even to attend the public schools,^o or to study the classical writers—overlooking the Divine element of the Gospel, ascribing its success to human culture, and thinking to defeat it by reducing its professors to the condition of an illiterate sect. This, however, appears to be a mistake, except in so far as the law against teaching must also have operated as a bar to learning; for many of those who in other times would have resorted to pagan masters for instruction in secular studies, must have felt themselves excluded from their schools, now that an attack was made on the Christian teachers, and that classical learning was to be used as a temptation to apostasy.^p

^h Greg. Naz. iv. 81.

ⁱ Ib. 82-3; Rufin. i. 32; Baron. 362. 31-7; Schröckh, vi. 323; Neander, iii. 68.

^j Greg. Naz. iv. 76.

^k Ib. 102.

^l Jul. Ep. 42; ap. Cyrill. i. vii. p. 229.

^m Greg. Naz. iv. 5-6, 101, seqq.; Soc. iii. 12; Soz. v. 18; Theod. iii. 8; Ullmann's Gregory of Nazianzum, by Cox,

88-90; Neand. 'Julian,' 132-5; Ch. Hist. iii. 80; Gieseler, I. ii. 19; Beugnot, i. 192-4; Milman, iii. 82-5. Sozocrates (loc. cit.) well defends the Christian use of heathen literature.

ⁿ Soc. iii. 16; Soz. v. 18; Vit. Greg. Naz. (by a monk named Gregory, in vol. i. of the Benedictine edition), 137.

^o Rufin. i. 32.

^p See Pagi, v. 142-3; Tillem. vii. 717-

While the emperor thus exerted himself against the Gospel, he yet paid it the remarkable tribute of attempting to reform paganism by borrowing from Christian institutions. He pointed to the Christians as distinguished by their obedience to the rules of their religion.⁹ He admonished the heathen priests to a stricter life than that which had been usual—charging them to abstain from secular business and amusements; to be charitable to the poor; to take care that their wives and families should not be Christians; to be diligent in study, and to abstain from the perusal of unedifying books. He attempted to imitate the system of episcopal superintendence, that of commendatory letters, the monastic orders, the penitential discipline, the arrangement of churches, the liturgy, the hours of prayer, the expositions of religious doctrine by preaching, the care of the poor and distressed, of the sick and of the dead.^r

The edict of Hadrian, which forbade the Jews to approach their holy city,^s was still in force; and the legislation of Constantine and his son had pressed severely upon them. Julian was favourably disposed towards their religion; he respected it as an ancient national faith, although he considered it to be wrong in representing its God as the only deity; and the Mosaic sacrifices accorded with his ideas as to outward worship.^t It is said that he summoned some of the most eminent Jews into his presence, and asked why they did not offer sacrifices according to their lawgiver's command. On their answering that it was not lawful to sacrifice except in the Temple of Jerusalem, of which they had been long deprived, the emperor gave them leave to rebuild the Temple, and appointed one of his own officers to superintend the work. The dispersed Jews assembled from all quarters, in eagerness to forward the undertaking by their labour and their hoarded wealth.^u Women gave their ornaments towards the cost, and themselves carried burdens of earth in their silken dresses; even tools of silver are said to have been used. The long-depressed people were loud in proclaiming their expectations of a triumphant restoration, when the attempt was terribly defeated. The newly-laid foundations were overthrown by an earthquake; balls of fire burst forth from the ground, scorching and killing many of the workmen; their

9; Warburton's 'Julian,' 26-7; Gibbon, ii. 313; Schröckh, vi. 318; Neander, iii. 80.

these statements—apparently for no other than theoretical reasons.

^s See p. 20.

^t Gibbon, ii. 304-7; Neander's Julian, 101-2.

^r Ep. 49; Fragm. p. 300-5; Greg. Naz. Orat. iv. 111; Soz. v. 16. M. de Beugnot (i. 203-4) denies the truth of

^u In the beginning of A.D. 363. Warburton, 54.

tools were melted by lightning; and it is added by some writers that the figure of a cross surrounded by a circle appeared in the sky, and that garments and bodies were marked with crosses, which it was impossible to efface. The truth of some of these phenomena is attested by Ammianus, as well as by Christian writers.^v As the rebuilding was avowedly undertaken in defiance of the Christian religion—as its success would have falsified the evidence borne to the Gospel by those words of Scripture which had declared that Judaism was passed away and that the Temple should be desolate—we may reverently believe that the occasion was one on which some special exertion of the Divine power might probably be put forth. It will, however, remain a question how much of the story ought to be regarded as fabulous embellishment; how far the occurrences which produced the impression of miracle may have been the result of ordinary physical causes, and how far there was a mixture of that which is more properly to be styled miraculous.^x

Julian spent the long winter evenings of 362-3 in composing an elaborate attack on Christianity, which he continued and finished after setting out on his expedition into Persia.^y He had intended, on his return, to resume the building of the Jewish Temple.^z What his policy might have been in other respects, if his life had been prolonged, can only be conjectured; but, as his enmity against the Christians had evidently increased, it is probable that the course which he had hitherto pursued with so little success would have been exchanged for a system of undisguised persecution.^a His death, in consequence of a wound received June 27, 363. in a nocturnal skirmish,^b was hailed by the Christians with joy. Prophecies and visions of his end had before been current among them.^c Some referred his wound to an angel. Sozomen, in reporting the groundless insinuation of Libanius,^d

^v Amm. Marc. xxii. 1; Greg. Naz. Orat. v. 4-7; Rufin. i. 37-9; Philostorg. vii. 9; Soc. iii. 20; Soz. v. 22; Theod. iii. 20.

^x See Warburton's 'Julian;' and Newman's Essay on Miracles, 165-175. Dr. Newman is able in this case to conduct his argument without the subtleties which mark other parts of the same essay. See also Schröckh, vi. 376-7; Guizot and Milman, in Gibbon, ii. 310-1; Neand. iii. 71; Gieseler, I. ii. 21; Guericke, i. 335.

^y Neand. iii. 120; Milman, iii. 103. Fragments are preserved in the answer

by Cyril of Alexandria.

^z Ep. 25. ^a Neand. iii. 94.

^b Amm. Marc. xxv. 3.

^c Soz. vi. 2; Theod. iii. 23-4; Chron. Pasch. A.D. 363. There were also heathen omens to the same effect. (Amm. Marc. xxiii. 1, 3; xxv. 2.) The Christians believed that Julian offered many young persons as victims in order to discover the future. (Soc. iii. 13; Till. Emp. iv. 527.) Schröckh (vi. 332-3) rejects these stories.

^d Orat. x. (t. ii. 324, ed. Morel. Paris, 1627). See Gibbon, ii. 378.

that it was inflicted not by a Persian but by a Christian, so far forgets his own Christianity as to argue that such an act may be laudably done for the cause of God and religion.^e

II. We now turn to the internal history of the Church.

Julian on his accession recalled all who had been banished on account of religion. In this measure his object was two-fold—to gain the praise of liberality, and at the same A.D. 362. time to damage the Christian cause by giving free scope to the dissensions of the various parties.^f But in the latter hope he was disappointed. The Arians, when deprived of the imperial support, lost all spirit and vigour; and the common danger from the ascendancy of paganism moderated the controversies which had raged so long and so fiercely.^g

Athanasius, when expelled from Alexandria in 356, had withdrawn into the deserts of Egypt. Among his faithful partisans, the monks, he found a refuge which enabled him to defy the enmity of Constantius, who attempted to arrest him, and exerted himself to prevent his reception in Ethiopia if he should flee into that newly-converted country.^h During an exile of six A.D. 356–362. years, the bishop kept a watchful eye on all the fortunes of the Church, and by seasonable writings combated the heresy which had driven him from his see.ⁱ

On receiving the tidings that Constantius was dead, the heathen populace of Alexandria murdered the intrusive bishop, Dec. 24, 361. George, who had made himself even more hateful to them than to the Catholics.^k Athanasius, on returning to resume his see, was received with triumphal pomp and festivity.^l The churches were at once surrendered to him, so that the Arians,

^e Soz. vi. 1–2. See Philostorg. vii. 15, with the remark of Photius. In the life of St. Macarius the Roman, it is said that Julian was killed by “Mercury, the martyr of Christ.” Rosweyde. t. i. 416.

^f Philostorg. vii. 41. “Nullas infestas hominibus bestias, ut sunt sibi ferales perique Christianorum, expertus.” Amm. Marcell. xxii. 5.

^g Soc. iii. 11; Soz. v. 5; vi. 4.

^h Tillem. viii. 183. See below, c. vi. § 1.

ⁱ The story which is told, and which is so attractive to Gibbon’s taste (ii. 234)—that Athanasius was entertained during all the time by a beautiful virgin (Soz. v. 6; Pallad. Hist. Lausiaca, 136)—is generally rejected as fabulous.

(Tillem. viii. 698; Schröckh, xii. 147.) The idea of his having been present, incognito, at Rimini or Seleucia, or both places, while the councils were sitting, is a needless and improbable inference from some words of his tract on those councils. See Tillem. viii. 705; Schröckh, xii. 205; Newman on Ath. Orat. 73.

^k Amm. Marc. xxii. 11; Epiphan. lxxvi. 1.

^l Greg. Naz. Orat. xxi. 26–9; Soc. iii. 2; Soz. v. 6–7; Kaye, 136–7. Sozomen says that he suddenly appeared by night in his cathedral, immediately after the death of Constantius—a manifest fable. Gibbon (ii. 324) dates his return on Feb. 21; Pagi (v. 103), in August.

who had set up one Lucius as their bishop, could only assemble in private houses.^m Athanasius proceeded to assemble a council, at which Lucifer of Cagliari and Eusebius of Vercelli, who had been released from banishment in the Thebaid, were invited to attend. Eusebius appeared, and the Sardinian bishop was represented by two of his deacons, while he himself repaired to Antioch, with the view of attempting to suppress the schism by which the church of that city had long been distracted.ⁿ

The case of the clergy who had conformed to Arianism in the late reign was decided with that wise consideration for persons which in Athanasius always accompanied his zeal for the truth. It was enacted that those who had erred through simplicity or ignorance should be allowed to retain their positions on subscribing the Nicene Creed; and that such as had taken a more active part on the Arian side should, on repentance, be admitted to communion, but should be deprived of ecclesiastical office.^o

Another question related to the use of certain theological terms. The words *ousia* and *hypostasis*^p had in the beginning of the controversy been used by the Orientals as equivalent; both had been translated in Latin by *substantia*, and had been understood by the Latins as signifying the *nature* of God. But in course of time a distinction had been introduced in the East, so that, while *ousia* continued to denote *nature*, *hypostasis* was used in the sense which we are accustomed to express by the term *Person*; and this distinction was especially characteristic of such theologians as had come out of the Arian connexion to embrace the Nicene faith.^q The Latins, then, hearing that three *hypostases* were maintained by some of the Orientals, took alarm, as if the words signified three different *grades* of nature; while the other party insisted on the necessity of using *hypostasis* in the new sense—considering that the Greek *prosopon*,^r which answered to the Latin *persona*, savoured of Sabellianism, as expressing rather three *manifestations* of the Godhead than that distinction which is asserted in the Catholic doctrine.^s The council endeavoured to settle this dispute by ascertaining and explaining that the difference as to one or three *hypostases* was merely verbal; and by recommending that the Nicene Creed should be adhered to, and that the terms in question should

^m Schröckh, xii. 7; Kaye, 137.

ⁿ Soc. iii. 5; Walch, iii. 348.

^o Hard. i. 729, or Ath. Tom. ad Antiochenos, t. i. pp. 770–7.

^p *οὐσία*, essence; *ὑπόστασις*, subsistence.

^q Petav. de Trin. IV. i. 8. See on the whole subject, De Trin. IV. i.–iv.,

vii.; De Incarn. II.

^r *πρόσωπον*, character or person; in the dramatic sense.

^s Sabellius himself admitted three *prosopa* in the sense to which the Orientals objected. See above, p. 86.

be avoided, except when opposition to particular heresies might render it necessary to use them.^t

Eusebius and others proceeded from Alexandria to Antioch with a commission to mediate in the healing of the schism. But in the mean time Lucifer had rashly taken a step which tended to exasperate and prolong it, by consecrating Paulinus, a presbyter of the Eustathian party, in opposition to Meletius, who had just returned from exile.^u Thus Antioch had three rival bishops—the Arian Euzoius, with the orthodox Meletius and Paulinus: and to these a fourth, of the Apollinarian sect,^v was soon after added. In such circumstances it was impossible to enforce any ecclesiastical discipline, since offenders, if threatened with censure in one communion, found the others ready to welcome them as proselytes; and in the meanwhile the wide patriarchal jurisdiction of Antioch, with the authority which belonged to the third of Christian sees in the general affairs of the Church, was in abeyance.^x

Eusebius mildly expressed his regret at the ordination of Paulinus, and forthwith quitted Antioch. But the vehement Lucifer disavowed the act of his representatives who had signed the Alexandrian decrees; he broke off communion with all bishops who should accept those decrees, and, after returning to his own diocese in Sardinia, he founded a schism, on the principle that no one who had subscribed the creed of Rimini should be admitted to reconciliation.^y This sect, which is not charged with any heretical doctrines, found a considerable number of adherents in Italy and Spain. It even set up a bishop at Rome; but Luciferianism became extinct in the beginning of the following century, if not earlier.^z

The schism of Antioch continued. Meletius was supported by the Eastern orthodox; Paulinus by Egypt and the West; and, notwithstanding the exertions of the Alexandrian Council, the difference of usage as to the term *hypostasis* continued to be a badge of the parties respectively.^a

Peace was established in the Western Church chiefly through

^t Hard. i. 733. See Hilar. de Synod. 68-71; Rufin. Hist. Eccl. i. 29; Soc. iii. 7; Soz. v. 12; Baron. 362. 188-9; 372. 29-31; Möhler, ii. 237-8; Newman, 390-6; Gieseler, I. ii. 64; Kaye, 139.

^u Soc. iii. 6; Soz. v. 12; Theod. iii. 5.

^v See below, pp. 265-6.

^x Tillem. x. 530; Möhler, ii. 249; Kaye, 141.

^y Soc. iii. 9; Soz. v. 13; Tillem. vii. 521; Walch, iii. 350-3; Kaye, 142. It appears from St. Jerome's Dialogue

against the Luciferians (c. 3) that Lucifer disallowed the ordination conferred by Arians, but recognised Arian baptism; whereas some of his followers even rebaptized converts from the church.

^a See the "Libellus" of the Luciferians Faustinus and Marcellinus, in Patrol. xiii.; Baron. 362. 221; 371, 127; Walch, iii. 370-1; Schröckh, vi. 209-217.

^z Theod. v. 3. with Valois' note; Walch, iv. 492-7; Newman, 397.

the labours of Eusebius and Hilary of Poitiers, who had been allowed to resume his bishoprick soon after the councils of Rimini and Seleucia, as the court party thought it desirable even on such terms to remove so formidable an opponent to a distance from the principal scene of action.^b The two bishops indefatigably exerted themselves for the re-establishment of orthodoxy on the terms of the Alexandrian synod, in which they obtained the concurrence of councils at Rome and elsewhere.^c

The effects of Athanasius' labours after his return to Alexandria soon drew on him the notice of Julian, who knew and dreaded his energetic character. The emperor, in the end of 362, directed against him a special mandate, stating that Athanasius had lately presumed to baptize some Greek (*i. e.*, heathen) ladies of high rank; and declaring that the edict by which exiles were allowed to return to their country had not been intended to restore them to their ecclesiastical offices—a distinction which appears to have been invented for the occasion, as it was not enforced in any other case. The Christians of Alexandria petitioned in favour of their bishop; but Julian was only the more exasperated. He styled Athanasius an “insignificant mannikin;”^d he told them that they were at liberty to make another bishop, but that so mischievous a person must not remain among them; and, whereas the former sentence had been limited to banishment from the city, it was now extended to all Egypt,^e with an order that it should be immediately executed.^f On hearing of the rescript, Athanasius said to his friends, “Let us withdraw; this is a little cloud which will soon pass over.” He sailed up the Nile, until, on being told that a vessel was in pursuit, he ordered the steersman to turn round, met the pursuers, who had not observed the movements of his boat, baffled their inquiries, and returned in safety to Alexandria. A renewal of the search, however, soon after compelled him to leave his place of concealment there, and he again found an asylum among the monks until he received the tidings of Julian's death.^g

^b Schröckh, xii. 309-11.

^c Soc. iii. 10; Fleury, xv. 30; Tillem. vii. 455-8; Schröckh, xii. 14-5, 317-8; Newman, 383.

^d ἀνθρωπίσκος εὐτελής.

^e It is even said that the emperor wished to kill him, and Möhler (ii. 240)

is inclined to believe the story.

^f Jul. Epp. 6, 26, 51.

^g Soc. iii. 13-4; Soz. v. 15; Theod. iii. 9. The emperor's death is said to have been revealed to him in the very hour when it took place by Theodore, abbot of Tabenne. Athan. t. i. 869.

CHAPTER IV.

FROM THE DEATH OF JULIAN TO THE END OF THE SECOND
GENERAL COUNCIL.

A.D. 363-381.

THE forced ascendancy of Paganism ended with the life of its patron. On the following day Jovian, a Christian, was ^{June 28,} chosen emperor. The army declared itself Christian; ^{363.} the Labarum, which had been disused during the reign of Julian, was again displayed at its head;^a the philosophers and soothsayers, who had basked in the favour of the late emperor, retired into obscurity.^b Jovian, however, allowed full toleration to his Pagan subjects;^c and, with respect to the divisions among Christians, he declared that he would molest no one on account of religion, but would love all who should study the Church's peace.^d

On his arrival at Antioch, after an ignominious, though necessary, accommodation with the Persians, and a disastrous retreat, the new emperor was beset by representatives of the various Christian parties, each hoping to gain him.^e His mind was, however, already decided in favour of the Nicene faith; he wrote to Athanasius, requesting instruction and advice, and inviting him to visit the court. The bishop complied, and by personal intercourse he gained an influence over Jovian which his enemies in vain attempted to disturb.^f The Acacians, with their usual suppleness, resolved to conform to the spirit of the time. They attended a synod held by Meletius at Antioch, and signed the Nicene Creed, evasively explaining *coessential* as meaning "begotten of the Father's essence, and like the Father in essence."^g

^a Soc. iii. 22; Tillem. Emp. iv. 579; Gibbon, ii. 380-2. Count de Beugnot (i. 222) denies La Bleterie's inference that the soldiers really had no religion; the army, he says, was made up of Christians and pagans, and, as a whole, followed the religion of the emperor.

^b Soc. iii. 24.

^c It would seem, nevertheless, from the complaints of Libanius (Vita, p. 46; Orat. x. p. 327, t. ii. ed. Morel.), that they suffered in this reign from

the populace in some places. Tillem. Emp. iv. 585-7. ^d Soc. iii. 25.

^e For the petitions of the Arians of Alexandria, and their conference with Jovian, see Athan. i. 782.

^f See Athan. i. 778-9; ad Jov. de Fide, ib. 780; Soc. iii. 24; Soz. vi. 5; Theod. iv. 2. Athanasius, while at Antioch, communicated with Paulinus. Walch, iv. 447.

^g Soc. iii. 25; Soz. vi. 4. St. Jerome says in his Chronicle (A.D. 367) that

The reign of Jovian lasted somewhat less than eight months; he was found dead in his bed at Dadastana, in Bithynia, on February 17, 364.^h

Valentinian was elected by the army on February 26, and a month later he associated with him his brother Valens, to whom he assigned the Eastern division of the empire.ⁱ Both brothers are said to have exposed themselves to danger by the profession of Christianity in the reign of Julian.^k Valentinian was possessed of many great qualities. He vigorously and successfully defended the northern frontiers against the barbarians who were pressing on the empire; he was the author of wise and important regulations for its internal government.^l But the justice on which he prided himself was relentlessly severe, and the manner of its execution was often inhuman. He was also subject to violent fits of passion, by one of which his death was occasioned.^m Valens, until elevated by his brother's favour, had been a person of little note. His capacity was inferior to that of Valentinian; he is described by Gibbon as "rude without vigour, and feeble without mildness."ⁿ

Valentinian adhered to the Nicene faith;^o but, warned by the ill success of Constantius in enforcing conformity, he adopted a policy of general toleration, to which a severe law against the Manichæans is not to be regarded as an exception, since it was rather directed against the magical practices of which they were suspected, than against their erroneous opinions.^p He invariably declined all interference in questions of doctrine, which he professed to leave to those who had been trained for the consideration of them.^q He allowed Auxentius, an Arian, to retain the important see of Milan—whether deceived by the bishop's specious professions, which might have been enough to satisfy an uncritical and somewhat indifferent soldier, or swayed by the influence of the Empress Justina, who was a zealous Arian.^r But with this exception the Western sees were, during Valentinian's reign, in the possession of orthodox bishops.

In the East it was otherwise. Valens is said to have been

they rejected both *homoousion* and *anomoion*, and took the middle term, *homoiouision*. The truth seems to be that they interpreted *homoousion* as if it were *homoiouision*. Petav. de Trin. IV. vi. 4.

^h Amm. Marcell. xxv. 10.

ⁱ Tillem. Emp. v. 7, 20.

^k Soz. vi. 6; Philostorg. vii. 7; Chron. Pasch. A.D. 369.

^l Amm. Marc. xxx. 9; Gibbon, ii. 395-401.

^m Amm. Marc. xxvii. 7; xxix. 3; xxx. 6; Tillem. Emp. v. 14-5, 73-4.

ⁿ ii. 391. Comp. Amm. Marc. xxxi. 14.

^o Kaye, 146.

^p Cod. Theod. XVI. v. 3 (A.D. 372).

See Godefroy's note.

^q Soc. iv. 1; Soz. vi. 21.

^r Baron. 369. 36; Tillem. Emp. v. 11; Schröckh, xii. 22-3.

originally a Catholic, and appears to have been alike ignorant and careless of religion: but he was won over to Arianism by his wife, who, in 367, as he was about to set out for the Gothic war, persuaded him to receive baptism from Eudoxius of Constantinople. It is said that the bishop exacted of him an oath to persecute the Catholics, and it is certain that the hostility which he had already shown towards them became from that time more bitter and active.^s

Macedonius, on his ejection from the see of Constantinople by the Acacians, had connected himself with the Semiarians, and, although he himself died soon after, the party thenceforth took its name from him.^t The Macedonians had requested Jovian either to establish the Creed of the Dedication, agreeably to the original and unbiassed decision of the Council of Seleucia; or, reverting to the condition in which things had stood before the meetings at Seleucia and Rimini, to summon a general synod, which should be free from all secular control.^u They now obtained leave from Valens to hold a council at Lampsacus—the A.D. 365. emperor supposing that they would agree with Eudoxius and the Acacians, who had by this time retracted their subscription to the Nicene Creed.^x The bishops who met at Lampascus, however, took up the same position with the majority of the Council of Seleucia. They signed the Creed of the Dedication, with the word *homoiousios*, which they declared to be necessary for preserving the personal distinction of the Godhead; they cited Eudoxius and his party before them, and on their nonappearance sentenced them to deposition. But on applying to Valens for a confirmation of their proceedings, they found that the Acacians had preoccupied his mind, and that they were themselves condemned to deprivation and banishment unless they would subscribe an Arian Creed.^y

The zeal which Valens soon after manifested in favour of Arianism induced the Macedonians to look towards the A.D. 366. West for sympathy and support. Deputies were sent into Italy with letters for Valentinian and Liberius. They found that the emperor was in Gaul, and did not follow him into that country. Liberius was at first distrustful of them; but on their anathematizing all heresies, and signing the *homoöusion* (which

^s Soc. iv. 8; Soz. vi. 9; Theod. iv. 12-3; Pagi, v. 228; Tillem. Emp. v. 89; Mém. vi. 532, 550. His enmity is said to have been mitigated after a time by an unexpected mediator—the heathen orator Themistius, who addressed

to him a plea for toleration. Soc. iv. 32.

^t Soz. iv. 26; Schröckh, vi. 192.

^u Soz. vi. 4.

^x Tillem. vi. 533; Möhler, ii. 246-7.

^y Soc. iv. 6; Soz. v. 7; Baron. 365. 2, seqq.

they interpreted as equivalent to *homoiousion*), he acknowledged them as being in communion with him, and wrote to the bishops by whom they had been commissioned. A like recognition was obtained from other Western bishops; and thus the Semiarians, with the exception of a few who disavowed the late proceedings, were reunited with the orthodox.^z

In 367 Valens issued an order that such bishops as had been banished by Constantius, and had returned to their sees under Julian, should again be ejected. At Antioch, where he established his residence, he drove out Meletius, although he allowed Paulinus to remain.^a It was attempted under the same law to expel Athanasius, and he is said in consequence to have taken refuge for a time in his father's tomb; but his people represented to the emperor that his case did not fall under the letter of the edict, and made such demonstrations of their attachment to the bishop in other ways, that Valens thought it well to permit his return. And thus, while the cause to which his life had been devoted was oppressed in all other parts of the Eastern empire, the great champion of orthodoxy was allowed to spend his last years in undisturbed possession of his see.^b

The elder actors in the Arian controversy were now passing away. Liberius died in 366, and the succession to the see of Rome was disputed by Damasus^c and Ursinus, or Ursicinus. This contest, which arose out of the old rivalry between Liberius and Felix, and did not involve any question of doctrine, occasioned violent tumults, and even great slaughter. On one occasion a hundred and sixty partisans of Ursinus, men and women, were killed in a church.^d At the end of three years Ursinus was banished to Gaul; but he repeatedly revived his claim to the bishoprick of Rome, both during the lifetime of Damasus and at

^z Epiph. lxviii. 10; Soc. ii. 8; Soz. vi. 10-12; Tillem. vi. 540-5; Newman, 404.

^a Soc. iv. 2; Tillem. vi. 548-9, 566-571.

^b Rufin. ii. 2; Soc. iv. 13, 20; Soz. vi. 12.

^c As the pronounciation of this pope's name has been a matter of dispute, it may be well to quote a line from his poems—

“Ut Damási precibus faveas, precor, inclyta virgo.”

Carm. 29 *De S. Agnete* (*Patrol.* xiii.).

^d Faustin. et Marcellin. Præf. 3 (*Patrol.* xiii.). Ammianus Marcellinus says that 137 dead bodies were found (xxvii. 9). Faustinus and Marcellinus

were partisans of Ursicinus, and Lucifarians. According to them Ursicinus was regularly elected, and Damasus, formerly an adherent of Felix, “quem in tantum matronæ diligebant ut *matronarum auriscalpius* diceretur” (*Præf.* 4), was guilty of all the bloodshed, but by visiting the court secured the banishment of his rival. Merenda, the editor of Damasus, denies the truth of this (*Patrol.* xiii.; *Proleg.* in Damas. 2, 3, 22); and an opposite tale is told by Jerome (*Chron.* A.D. 369), Rufinus (ii. 10), and others of the successful party. See Amm. Marc. xxvii. 3, 9; Soc. iv. 29; Soz. vi. 23; Tillem. viii. 387-396; Schröckh, viii. 107-110; Milman, *Lat. Christ.* 67-70.

his death. Acacius died in 366;^e Hilary in 367 or 368.^f The last mention of Ursacius and Valens as living is in the condemnation pronounced on them by synods at Rome and elsewhere about 369.^g Eudoxius of Constantinople died in 370;^h Lucifer of Cagliari, in 371;ⁱ Euzoius of Antioch, in 376.^k

On the death of Eudoxius the Catholics of Constantinople set up Evagrius as his successor, and the Arians Demophilus; but Evagrius was soon driven out, and his adherents were subjected to a variety of outrages. Eighty presbyters of the party carried a complaint to Valens at Nicomedia; they were compelled to embark on board a ship, which the crew (it is said, by command of one of the emperor's officers) set on fire and deserted; and the whole company of ecclesiastics perished.^l Other barbarities are related of Valens—as that at Antioch he ordered many of the orthodox to be drowned in the Orontes.^m The monks of Egypt and Pontus were especially obnoxious to him—partly because the monastic profession afforded to many an excuse for indolence, and withdrew them from their duties to the state, and partly on account of their steady adherence to the Nicene faith and the exertion of their great influence in its behalf. He ordered in 373 that monks should be dragged from their holes, and should be compelled to perform their service as citizens, under the penalty of being beaten to death.ⁿ The Egyptian deserts were invaded by soldiers commissioned to enforce the edict, and many of the monks suffered death in consequence.^o

Athanasius is supposed by the best authorities to have died in May, 373.^p He had named as his successor Peter, one of his presbyters. The Arian Lucius, who had been set up as bishop after the murder of George, and had held possession of the see during the exile of Athanasius under Julian, was now brought

^e Tillem. vi. 535.

^f Pagi, v. 265; Tillem. vii. 463.

^g Ath. ad Afros, 1; Ad. Epictet. 1 (t. i. 891, 901). Tillem. viii. 396; Schröckh, xii. 33.

^h Tillem. vi. 553.

ⁱ Baron. 371. 121.

^k Tillem. vi. 603.

^l Greg. Naz. Orat. xiii. 46; Soc. iv. 15-6; Soz. vi. 14. Dean Milman (iii. 125) thinks it doubtful whether such orders had been given. Gibbon (ii. 404) of course makes as little as possible of the persecution by Valens. The old ecclesiastical historians connect the story of the emperor's own death—that he was burnt in a cottage where he had taken refuge—with the fate of these

victims. Such tracings of a connexion between misdeeds and calamities are of continual occurrence in these writers.

^m Soc. iv. 2; Soz. vi. 18; Theod. iv. 24.

ⁿ The word is *militare*, and it has been commonly said that Valens wished the monks to bear arms. But Godefroy says that the word is also applied to civil services, and that its meaning here is general. In Cod. Theod. t. iv. 413; cf. Cod. Justin. X. xxxi. 26.

^o Cod. Theod. XII. i. 63; Soc. iv. 21; Soz. vi. 20; Tillem. vi. 602; Gibbon, ii. 406; Schröckh, xii. 48.

^p Pagi, v. 371; Tillem. viii. 250, 719; Schröckh, xii. 237; Clinton; Pref. to Festal Letters, xi.

back by his party, and Peter was driven out with circumstances of outrage and profanation similar to those which had accompanied the expulsions of his great predecessor by Gregory and George. Peter took refuge at Rome, and after a time returned with letters of recommendation from the bishop, Damasus; whereupon, as Valens was then at a distance—having been diverted from theological controversies by the Gothic war—the people rose against Lucius and reinstated the orthodox bishop.^a

Valentinian was succeeded in 375 by his son Gratian, who had already for eight years held the dignity of Augustus.^r The new emperor, whose own age was only sixteen, admitted as a nominal colleague his half-brother, the younger Valentinian, a child four years old. By the death of Valens, at the disastrous battle of Adrianople, Gratian became in 378 master of

Aug. 9, 378. the whole empire; but he hastened to relieve himself of a part of his cares by bestowing the sovereignty of the East on Jan. 379. Theodosius, son of a general of the same name, whose

distinguished services in Britain and in Africa had been requited by his execution at Carthage three years before.^s The younger Theodosius had since lived in retirement on his estates in Spain, until he was summoned to share the empire, in the hope that his talents might avert the dangers with which it was threatened by the Gothic invaders.^t

Gratian, on succeeding to the dominions of Valens, proclaimed liberty of religion to all except Manichæans, Eunomians, and Photinians, and recalled the banished bishops of the East.^u The Semiarrians, on being thus freed from the oppression of Valens, broke off the connexion which they had so eagerly formed with the orthodox; many, however, refused to join in the movement, and remained united to the Catholic body.^x

It would seem to have been about this time that a denial of the Divinity of the Holy Ghost became the chief characteristic of the party.^y Heterodox opinions on that subject had been implied in all the varieties of Arianism; but as the nature of the Third Person in the Trinity had not been brought into discussion while

^a Rufin. ii. 3-4; Soc. iv. 21, 33-7; Theod. XVI. v. 4-5; Gothofr. in Cod. Soz. vi. 19; Theod. iv. 20-2.

^r Not *Cæsar*, according to earlier practice. Tillem. Emp. v. 30.

^s Gibbon, ii. 428.

^t Ib. 488, 495.

^u Soc. v. 4; Soz. vii. 1; Tillem. Emp. v. 154. All heresies were forbidden by two laws of the following year. Cod.

Theod. t. vi. 117.

^x Soc. v. 4; Soz. vii. 2; Tillem. vi. 613; Schröckh, xii. 52.

^y It had not become conspicuous when the Semiarrians were admitted to communion by Liberius, in 366. Tillem. vi. 543.

the Godhead of the Son was in question, nothing had been defined respecting it in the Nicene creed.² Athanasius, however, with his characteristic perception of consequences, had always strenuously asserted the equal and coessential Godhead of the Spirit, as well as that of the Son,^a and, in a treatise written from the desert during his exile under Constantius, had confuted the error of the *Pneumatomachi* (or adversaries of the Spirit), which was then acquiring distinctness.^b The name of *Macedonianism*, which was afterwards attached to this heresy, would naturally convey the idea that it was invented by Macedonius. It was not, however, properly speaking, an invention; it was a remnant of Arianism retained by a party which had shaken off the other errors of that system; for the Semiarians now acknowledged the Godhead of the Son, while they maintained that the Spirit was as a servant—as one of the angels.^c Nor do we know what opinion Macedonius held on the question; his name is connected with the heretical tenet only through the circumstance that the Semiarians were called after him at the time when this came into prominence as the mark of their party, he himself having died some years before.^d

In the meanwhile the Nicene faith had made progress. The consistency of its supporters stood in advantageous contrast with the continual variations of their opponents. The monks lent to it the great and growing authority of their reputation for sanctity; and, as has been mentioned, a large portion of the Semiarians adhered to the orthodox connexion into which they had been driven by the tyranny of Valens. Throughout all the long controversy the belief of the great mass of Christians had been very little affected. In their pastoral teaching, as in their creeds, the Arian bishops and clergy had usually studied to observe orthodoxy of statement and language, so that their doctrine, although incomplete, was not untrue. Thus their flocks received the words in the sound meaning which was apparent on the surface, so that, according to a celebrated expression of St. Hilary, “The ears of the people were holier than the hearts of the priests.”^e And now, although Athanasius was gone, the great weight of talents and

^a Basil. Ep. cxxv. 3; Walch, iii. 100.

^b *E.g.* Ep. ad Afros, 11.

^c Ath. Epp. ad Serapion. i. 1; iv. (the date is about A.D. 360); Soz. vi. 22; Neand. iv. 84; Gieseler, I. ii. 69-70.

^d Greg. Naz. Orat. xli. 8; Epiph. lxxiv. 1; Soz. iv. 27; Petav. de Trin. I. xiv. 17; Kaye, 148. Some Macedonians

apparently held the Spirit to be a *creature*, and others, an *influence*. Greg. Naz. Orat. xxi. 5; Petav. de Trin. I. xiv. 17; Walch, iii. 98.

^e Soc. ii. 45; Soz. iv. 27; Theod. ii. 6; Gieseler, I. ii. 70.

^f Contra Auxentium, 6 (written in 364). See Giesel. I. ii. 61-2; Möhler, ii. 85-6; Neand. iv. 83.

learning among the Christians was on the side of orthodoxy, which had gained a very important accession in the East. A class of theologians had arisen, who, born and educated in countries where Semiarianism prevailed, had in their earlier years been connected with that system—trained up according to its sound, though imperfect, creeds, in such a manner that one of them, when he had become an eminent champion of the Nicene doctrine, could yet speak of his opinions as having undergone no other change than a development like that of the plant from the seed.^f The members of this school maintained the identity of *homoousion* with *homoiousion*;^g they brought with them into the orthodox communion many of their old associations; and through their influence it was that several Semiarians have been acknowledged by the Church as saints, and that the canons of the Semiarian councils of Antioch (A.D. 341) and Laodicea (A.D. 372?) gained a reception in the East, which was eventually extended to the West.^h The most distinguished of the “later Nicene” teachers were three Cappadocians—Basil, his brother Gregory of Nyssa, and his friend Gregory of Nazianzum. The first and the last of these must be here more particularly noticed.

Basil and Gregory were born about the same time—probably in the year 329.ⁱ Basil was of a noble Christian family.^k The father of Gregory had belonged to a sect known by the name of Hypsistarians, whose creed was a strange medley of Jewish and Persian notions;^l he had been converted by his wife Nonna, a woman of remarkable piety, and had been appointed to the bishoprick of Nazianzum, a poor diocese, which had fallen into great disorder in consequence of long vacancy and neglect.^m An acquaintance formed between the youths at the schools of Cæsarea, in their native province, ripened into the closest intimacy at Athens, where they spent several years.ⁿ They were

^f Basil, Ep. cxxii. 3.

^g Gieseler, I. ii. 66.

^h Schröckh, xiii. 87–92; Gieseler, I. ii. 67–8.

ⁱ As to Basil there is little question (Tillem. ix. 2). But Romanist writers, unwilling to suppose that Gregory was born after his father had become a bishop, are inclined to place his birth earlier—some of them (as Pagi, vi. 41), in 300, which would make his life extend to ninety years. See Gibbon, ii. 510; Schröckh, xiii. 269–270; Clinton, ann. 325, 390; Theiner, Einführung d. erw. Ehelosigkeit, i. 265; Ullmann's

Gregory of Nazianzum (transl. by G. V. Cox, Lond. 1851), 299, 308. Dupin's date (ii. 201) is 318.

^k Greg. Orat. xliii. 3.

^l See Ullmann, 308–311; Gieseler, I. ii. 17; Matter, Hist. du Gnosticisme, iii. 110–4; Dörner, ii. 40–2. The name is derived from their professing to worship the Highest (τὸν Ὑψιστον).

^m Greg. Orat. vii. 4; viii. 4–5; xviii. 5, 8–13, 16; Carm. l. II. i. 117, seqq.; de Vita sua, 51, seqq.

ⁿ Greg. Orat. xliii. 13–19; de Vita sua, 221–236.

distinguished in all the studies of that city, and withstood the influences by which many who, like themselves, had been trained in the Christian faith, were there drawn away to heathenism.^o During a part of the time Julian was their fellow-student; and Gregory professes to have already observed in him indications of his future evil course.^p Both Basil and Gregory resolved to renounce the hopes of secular eminence, and embrace a religious life. Each was baptized after leaving Athens; Gregory promised at the font to devote all his gifts and powers to the service of God.^q Basil, after travelling in Egypt and elsewhere, became one of the clergy of Cæsarea, in his native province. He withdrew for A.D. 357– five years into the desert of Pontus, where he founded 362. monastic establishments—monachism having been lately introduced into that country by Eustathius, bishop of Sebaste.^r The system which Basil adopted was the cœnobitic, as being more conducive than the solitary life to the exercise of graces. “God,” he said, “has made us—even like the bodily members—to need one another’s help. For what discipline of humility, of pity, or of patience can there be, if there be no one towards whom these virtues can be practised? Whose feet wilt thou wash, whom wilt thou serve, how canst thou be the last of all—if thou art alone?”^s Practical industry was combined with religious exercises, and by the labours of his monks a barren tract was brought into cultivation and fertility.^t Basil returned to Cæsarea in 362, and was ordained presbyter; but after a short time he again retired into the desert for three years, in consequence of some unexplained jealousy on the part of his bishop Eusebius.^u In each of his retreats he was accompanied for a time by Gregory, who, however, was on both occasions called away by disagreements between his father and the monks of Nazianzum, originating in the circumstance that the aged bishop had been induced to sign the creed of Rimini. Gregory by his ascetic life had gained a powerful influence over the monks; he convinced them that his father had been deceived through ignorance of controversial subtleties, and had acted without any heretical intention; and he twice succeeded in

^o Greg. Orat. xliii. 20–2; Vita Greg. 129–132; Soc. iv. 26; Soz. vi. 17. Gregory’s account of Athenian student life is curious. Among other things he tells us that Basil’s character commanded such respect as to procure for him exemption from the tricks usually practised on freshmen, xliii. 16.

^p Orat. v. 23–4.

^q Ullmann, 49.

^r When Eustathius afterwards fell into disrepute (see Tillem. t. ix. *passim*), the beginning of the work was generally ascribed to St. Basil. Walch, iii. 552–3; Schröckh, xiii. 25–7.

^s Basil. Resp. vii. t. ii. 345–8.

^t Tillem. ix. 44; Milman, iii. 195–6.

^u Greg. Orat. xliii. 28; Tillem. ix. 67–71.

establishing peace.^x He also reconciled Basil with Eusebius;^y and on that bishop's death he effected the promotion of his friend A.D. 370 or to the see of Cæsarea, to which was attached the primacy
371. of the greater part of Asia Minor.^z

The indefatigable labours of Basil, his controversies, his endeavours to unite the orthodox among themselves, to gain over sectaries to the Church, and to establish peace between the East and the West, must be passed over with a mere allusion.^a During the short time between his elevation and the death of Athanasius he enjoyed the confidence of that great prelate; and he succeeded him as leader of the Eastern orthodox.^b Like Athanasius, he was able to preserve his Church from the Arianism which was triumphant throughout the East during the reign of Valens. While A.D. 366. a presbyter under Eusebius, he had baffled the theologians of the emperor's train in disputation;^c but soon after his advancement to the episcopate a fresh attempt was made on him. Valens, determined that Cæsarea alone should not continue to resist him, sent Modestus, prefect of Cappadocia, with a commission to expel Basil if he should refuse to conform to the dominant religion. Modestus summoned the archbishop to appear before him. To his threats Basil replied that he did not fear them; confiscation, he said, could not touch a man who had no property except a single suit of ragged clothes and a few books; as for banishment, he denied that such a thing was possible—go where he might, he could find a home, or rather he regarded the whole earth as God's, and himself as a stranger everywhere; his feeble body could bear no tortures beyond the first stroke; and death would be a favour, since it would conduct him to God. The prefect, who had opened the conference in a very peremptory tone, was subdued by the archbishop's firmness,^d and reported the result to his master, who soon after arrived at Cæsarea. Valens himself was awed by the presence of Basil and by the solemnity of the Catholic worship, which he witnessed on the feast of the Epiphany, but without being admitted to communicate. The impression thus made is said to have been heightened by miracles; and not only was Basil left unmolested in his see, but the emperor

^x Greg. Orat. vi.; xliii. 29; Vita, 133-5; Tillem. ix. 40, 60, 347; Ullmann, 65, 72.

^y Greg. Orat. xliii. 33; Epp. 16-18.

^z Basil. Ep. 47; Greg. Epp. 40-4; Vita. 138; Pagi, v. 270, 289, 297.

^a The life of St. Basil is related at great length by Tillemont (vol. ix.), by Schröckh (vol. xiii.), and in the Bene-

dictine edition. Klose's 'Basilius der Grosse' (Stralsund, 1835) has not fallen in my way.

^b Tillem. viii. 245. There are letters to Athanasius among Basil's Epistles.

^c Greg. Orat. xliii. 32; Tillem. ix. 90, 654.

^d Tillem. ix. 155-6; Schröckh, xiii. 101.

bestowed a valuable estate as an endowment on a large hospital which the archbishop's charity had founded.^e

Soon after this Valens divided Cappadocia into two provinces; whereupon Anthimus, bishop of Tyana, which became the capital of the second division, asserted that the ecclesiastical government ought to follow the arrangements of the civil, and claimed for himself the rights of a metropolitan.^f Finding ^{A.D. 372.} that the claim revived some jealousies which had been felt at his election to Cæsarea, Basil resolved to strengthen himself by erecting new bishopricks; and one of the places chosen for this purpose was Sasima, an outpost on the border of his opponent's province—the meeting-place of three great roads, a posting-station and the seat of a frontier custom-house; a wretched little town, dry, dusty, and continually disquieted by the brawls of carters, travellers, and revenue-officers.^g Here Basil, with that disregard for the character and feelings of others which is not uncommon in persons of a strongly practical nature, determined to place Gregory, who had some years before been forcibly ordained^h a presbyter by his father. Gregory said that the archbishop's elevation had caused him to forget what was due to their ancient and equal friendship;ⁱ he resisted until he was overpowered by the united urgency of his father and Basil;^k and he afterwards traced all the troubles of his life to the consent which was at length extorted from him.^l After his consecration he felt himself oppressed by his high views of

^e Greg. Orat. xliii. 48, seqq.; Soc. iv. 26; Soz. vi. 6; Tillem. ix. 161. On the hospital, see Greg. l. c. 63. In connexion with the scene between Basil and Valens, Gibbon quotes from St. Jerome's Chronicle (A.D. 380)—“Basilus . . . clarus habetur . . . qui multa continentiae bona uno superbiae malo perdidit.” “This irreverent passage,” says the historian, “is perfectly in the style and character of St. Jerome. It does not appear in Scaliger's edition of his Chronicle; but Isaac Vossius found it in some old MSS., which had not been reformed by the monks” (ii. 405). The editors do not deny the genuineness of the words “qui . . . perdidit,” but are indignant with Vossius, and transfer them to the preceding line of the Chronicle, which has Photinus for its subject. But if the words related to so friendless a reputation as *his*, why should they be wanting in any copies? They are, indeed, too “perfectly in the style and character of St. Jerome” to affect St. Basil's good name very seriously if they stood by themselves, since he was

obnoxious to Jerome as an abettor of Meletius (Basil. Epp. 67, 89, 114, 258), and as having had some disagreements with Damasus. But charges of pride and superciliousness against Basil appear to have been common. Gregory, in his panegyrical oration (xliii. 64), defends him against them on the somewhat unsatisfactory ground that he was tender to the poor, to lepers, and other objects of pity. Rufinus, in characterising the friends, says, that Basil was humble towards God, but that Gregory was so towards men also. Hist. Eccl. ii. 9.

^f Basil. Epp. 74, 77; Greg. Orat. xliii. 58.

^g Greg. Orat. xliii. 54; de Vita sua, 439-446; Vita, 159. See the Benedictine Preface, 35, seqq.

^h De Vita sua, 338-349; Ullmann, 67.

ⁱ Ep. 48; Orat. x. 2; xliii. 59; de Vita sua, 398-414, 475, 485.

^k De Vita sua, 425.

^l Orat. xviii. 37; xliii. 59.

the episcopal responsibility, by his love for a life of contemplation, and the sense of his unfitness to dispute his position with Anthimus.^m He refused to proceed to Sasima, and was then persuaded by his father to assist him in the care of Nazianzum.ⁿ After the old man's death, in 374, Gregory continued for some time to administer the diocese, while he endeavoured to obtain the appointment of a regular bishop; but, finding his exertions for this purpose vain, he withdrew to Seleucia, where he spent three or four years in retirement.^o

Theodosius, as a Spaniard, belonged to the Nicene party, but at the time of his elevation to the empire was only a catechumen. In the beginning of 380, he fell dangerously sick at Thessalonica; when he sent for the bishop of the place, and, after having ascertained his orthodoxy, received baptism at his hands.^p His admission to the Church was followed by an edict, which was at first limited to Constantinople, but in the following year was extended to all his dominions—that those only should be acknowledged as Catholic Christians who adhered to the faith of the coessential Trinity, as it had been taught by St. Peter to the Romans, and was then held by Damasus of Rome and Peter of Alexandria; that all who denied this doctrine should be reputed as heretics and discouraged.^q Gratian also—at the instigation (it is supposed) of Ambrose, bishop of Milan—limited by later edicts the toleration which he had announced in 378.^r

In November, 380, Theodosius arrived at Constantinople. About two years before, when the death of Valens appeared to open a new prospect to the orthodox, Gregory of Nazianzum had been persuaded by Basil and others leaders of the party to undertake a mission to that capital.^s He entered on the enterprise with much distrust of his qualifications. Arianism was in great strength at Constantinople, where the see had for nearly forty years been filled by its partisans. The Novatianists had some churches; the Apollinarians were gaining a footing in the city; but the orthodox were very few, and even these were divided among themselves by sympathy with the opposite parties in the schism of Antioch.^t

^m Epp. 48-50.

ⁿ De Vita sua, 495-529; Tillem. ix. 180-1, 390-9; Ullmann, 127.

^o Vita, 140-1; Tillem. ix. 404-5.

^p Soc. v. 6; Tillem. Emp. v. 97.

^q Cod. Theod. XVI. i. 2; Soz. vii. 4.

^r Cod. Theod. XVI. v. 4-5, dated from Milan, in 379, repeal the edict issued at Sirmium in the preceding

year (p. 254), and forbid *all* heresies. See Gothofr. in Cod. Theod. t. vi. 117.

^s De Vita sua, 585-606; Vita, 142; Pagi in Bar. v. 464; Tillem. ix. 411-4, 707; Ullmann, 166.

^t Greg. de Vita sua, 583, seqq.; Tillem. ix. 436; Schröckh, xiii. 336; Ullmann, 162-3.

Gregory was obliged at first to officiate in the house of a relation—which, from the resurrection (*anastasis*) of the true faith, acquired the name of *Anastasia*,^u and was afterwards enlarged into a splendid church. At the outset, he had to encounter much prejudice. His austere, simple, and recluse life appeared in unpopular contrast with the free and secular habits of the Arian clergy.^x His doctrine was regarded as polytheistic.^y He was repeatedly assaulted by the populace, and by the staff of the Arian establishment—monks, virgins, and beggars; he was stoned, he was carried before magistrates as a disturber of the peace, his church was invaded by night and profaned.^z But he persevered in his mission, and, although the object of it was controversial, he earnestly endeavoured to counteract in his hearers the prevailing habit of familiarly discussing the highest mysteries of religion—exhorting them “not to make a sport of the things of God, as if they were matters of the theatre or of the race-course.”^a By degrees, his eloquence, the practical and religious tone of his doctrinal teaching, and the influence of his mild and serious character, began to tell; the little *Anastasia* became unable to contain the crowds which resorted to it.^b The progress of this success had, indeed, been slightly interrupted by one Maximus, an Egyptian, who was originally a cynic philosopher. This person, after having insinuated himself into Gregory’s confidence, was ordained bishop in a disorderly manner by some emissaries of Peter of Alexandria, although Peter had before approved of Gregory’s mission.^c But the pretender was rejected by the people, and in vain endeavoured to find support from the emperor and from the bishop of Rome.^d

On his arrival at Constantinople, Theodosius summoned before him the Arian bishop, Demophilus, and required him to subscribe the Nicene creed, on pain of deprivation. Nov. 380. Demophilus assembled his flock, and reminded them of the charge “when persecuted in one city” to “flee to another.” The Arians were forthwith turned out of all the churches, and began to hold their meetings without the walls of the capital.^e A few days after

^u Vita, 143. * Orat. xxxiii.; xxxvi. 2.

^y De Vita sua, 655.

^z Ib. 652-678; Soz. vii. 5; Tillem. ix. 414, 418, 425-8, 431-3, 708-9.

^a Orat. xxii. 8; xxvii. 3, 31; xxxii. 20, 32, &c.; De Vita sua, 1208, seqq.; Neander, iv. 80.

^b De Vita sua, 1079-1272; Soz. vii. 9; Gibbon, ii. 520; Schröckh, xiii. 389-90.

^c De Vita sua, 773-1030; Vita, 145-7. Gregory amuses himself with the change

of a dog into a shepherd—

κυνῶν τυπαῖσι τὸν κάκιστον ποιμένα, κείναντες. κ.τ.λ. 912-3.

^d Damas. Ep. 5 (Patrol. xiii.); Theod. v. 7; Tillem. ix. 443-7. Maximus contrived to get St. Ambrose into his interest (Ambr. Ep. 14). Ullmann (203) and Dean Milman (iii. 202) suppose that by this consecration the Alexandrians meant to set up a claim of supremacy over Constantinople.

^e Soc. iv. 7.

this, Theodosius formally put Gregory into possession of the principal church of Constantinople. The morning was gloomy, Gregory was suffering from illness, and, as the procession passed through streets lined with troops, he was dismayed by the thought that a bishop should need such a protection against his own flock. But at the moment of his entrance into the choir, a sudden burst of sunshine lighted up the building, and the people, catching enthusiasm from the change, cried out that the emperor should place him on the episcopal throne. Gregory, however, declined to take his seat, and feeling himself, from agitation and bodily weakness, unable to address the congregation, he employed the voice of another to speak—"Now it is time to acknowledge the benefits which the Blessed Trinity has bestowed on us; but of the throne we will consider hereafter."^f Such was the exasperation of the Arians that attempts were made to assassinate him.^g

Theodosius proceeded to assemble a council, which met at Constantinople on May 2, 381. It was composed of A.D. 381. oriental bishops only; but its decrees were afterwards gradually received throughout the west, and it is consequently acknowledged as the Second General Council.^h A hundred and fifty orthodox prelates attended. Among them were Meletius, Gregory of Nyssa (whose brother Basil had died in the preceding year),ⁱ and Cyril of Jerusalem, who had formerly been connected with the Semiarian party. The Macedonians had been invited, in the hope that they might renew the union which they had formed with the Catholics in the reign of Valens; but, although thirty-six of them appeared, it was found that they would not submit to a reconciliation.^k

Meletius, to whom the see of Antioch had lately been adjudged by an imperial commissary, presided in the earlier sessions;^l and by him, after an examination of the pretensions of Maximus,^m Gregory was solemnly installed as bishop of Constantinople.ⁿ But Meletius died while the council was sitting,^o and deplorable dissensions followed. With a view to healing the schism which had

^f De Vita sua, 1305-1595; Vita, 151-2; Tillem. Emp. v. 208; Mém. ix. 459; Gibbon, ii. 521.

^g De Vita sua, 1445; Vita, 151.

^h Pagi, v. 498-9; Newman, n. on Fleury, vol. i. p. iii. Tillem. Emp. v. 213; Schröckh, ix. 305.

ⁱ Clinton, A.D. 380.

^k Soc. v. 8; Soz. vii. 7; Walch, iii. 109.

^l Theod. v. 3.

^m The consecration of Maximus, and his episcopal acts, are annulled by the fourth canon of the council.

ⁿ De Vita sua, 1525.

^o Tillem. viii. 374. Walch (iv. 465-7) notices the perplexities of Romish writers as to this case of a person who died out of communion with Rome, and yet is regarded as a saint. Comp. Tillem. xvi. 372, 661.

so long afflicted the church of Antioch, six of its clergy, who were regarded as the most likely to be raised to the episcopate, had lately entered into an engagement, which is said to have been even ratified by an oath, that on the death of either Paulinus or Meletius, they would acknowledge the survivor as rightful bishop;^p but a jealousy which had arisen between the Asiatic bishops and those of Egypt and the West now interfered with this arrangement. The Asiatics objected to Paulinus as having been ordained by a Latin, Lucifer, and as being connected with the Latin party; and, notwithstanding the earnest remonstrances of Gregory,^q now president of the council,^r whose natural inclination towards the Meletian party was overpowered by his desire of peace, and by his sense of the impropriety of the proceeding—they consecrated Flavian, one of the six who are represented as having bound themselves to renounce their pretensions to the see.^s

Timothy, who had just succeeded his brother Peter^t at Alexandria, soon after arrived, with a train of bishops. The Egyptians were offended at not having been sooner summoned to the council, and were greatly exasperated by the late proceedings. They resolved once more to set up their countryman Maximus, and to depose Gregory, on the pretext that his appointment to Constantinople was in breach of a Nicene Canon, which forbade the translation of bishops. The malice and unfairness of this objection were palpable; for the canon had often been disregarded in practice, and Gregory's acceptance of the see hardly came even within its letter, inasmuch as he had neither acted in the diocese of Sasima, nor been appointed to that of Nazianzum; much less did it violate the intention of the canon, which was to check the ambition of bishops.^u But he was not disposed to contest the question. He was sick both in body and in spirit, and even before the opening of the council had attempted to withdraw from his

^p Soz. vi. 7. Theodoret (v. 3) gives a somewhat different account (see Schröckh, xii. 51-2).

^q De Vita sua, 1590-1679.

^r Pref. to Orat. xlii. in the Bened. edition.

^s Soc. v. 9; Soz. vii. 11; Baron. 381. 44; Tillem. ix. 479; x. 529; Schröckh, xiii. 418; Ullmann, 245; Newman, 417. Tillemont questions the story of the oath (viii. 371; x. 527). Walch thinks the whole account of the arrangement improbable (iv. 462, 471). All that we really know of Flavian is greatly to his honour (ibid. 472-3, 476). The

election was not made by the council, but probably by the bishops of the Antiochene patriarchate who were then at Constantinople. See Walch, iv. 471.

^t Peter seems to have before his death resumed communion with Gregory. Tillem. ix. 456; Schröckh, xiii. 393.

^u Can. Nic. c. 15. The prohibition had been more particularly repeated in canons of Antioch and Sardica. But it had been so often evaded by distinctions, or overruled, that Gregory styled it a "dead and extinct law." De Vita sua, 1810-1.

stormy position of eminence to the quiet life of contemplation which he best loved;^v he had accepted the bishoprick only in the hope that he might be able to mediate between the eastern and the western (or Egyptian) parties.^w Both now turned against him—the Asiatics, because he had opposed them in the matter of Antioch; the bishops of Egypt and Macedonia, because, although opposed to the election of Flavian, he had presided over the council by whose members it was determined. The archbishop entreated that no one would maintain his rights, and declared that he would gladly become a Jonah to appease the furious waves of party strife. His resignation was accepted—reluctantly by the emperor, but with an indecent eagerness by the majority of the bishops;^x and he took leave of the council in an eloquent and pathetic discourse—stating his orthodox faith, recounting his labours at Constantinople, and strongly denouncing the luxury and secularity, the jealousies and corruptions, which disgraced the Church and her rulers.^y A list of persons qualified to succeed to the bishoprick was drawn up, and from it the emperor selected Nectarius, a man of senatorial rank, who was as yet only a catechumen. He was forthwith baptized, and within a few days was consecrated—wearing the episcopal robes over the white dress of a neophyte.^z Gregory, after leaving Constantinople, again assumed the charge of Nazianzum, until he succeeded in obtaining the appointment of a regular bishop.^a He spent his last years in retirement, soothing himself with the composition of poetry, and died in 389 or 390.^b

The council of Constantinople, by additions to the article on the Holy Ghost, brought the Nicene Creed to its present form, except that the procession of the Spirit from the Son was not mentioned.^c Among its canons was one which assigned to the Bishop of Con-

^v De Vita sua, 1745; De Vita sua, 153, 155.

^w De Vita sua, 1529, seqq.

^x De Vita sua, 1865-1904; Vita, 156.

^y Orat. xlii.; Soz. vii. 7; Theod. v. 8. There are also farewell poems, lib. ii. 4-12.

^z Theod. v. 7; Soz. vii. 8; Bingham, IV. ii. 16. Such sudden elevations had been forbidden by canons (Can. Nic. ii.; Can. Sardic. x.; Can. Laodic. iii.). The only thing that seems creditable to Nectarius (says Tillemont, ix. 486-8) is the circumstance that when Theodosius had marched against Maximus, the Arians, on a false report of his defeat,

burnt the bishop's house (Soc. v. 13); and (he adds) even of this the meritoriousness is questionable, since the heretics do not appear to have acted from personal dislike of the bishop.

^a Epp. 182-3.

^b Vita, 157-8; Tillem. ix. 505, 555; Ullmann, 271-297; Pagi, vi. 39, says 391.

^c The words "and the Son" were added in Spain (Tillem. ix. 495; Schröckh, ix. 301-3). Their first appearance in the Creed is at the Council of Toledo, A.D. 589 (Gieseler, II. i. 107). See below, c. xiii. 3; Book III. c. vii. 4.

stantinople a precedence next after the Bishop of Rome—"forasmuch as it is a new Rome."^d

Of the heresies condemned by the council, the only one which has not been already noticed is the Apollinarian. The founder of this, Apollinarius or Apollinaris, was son of an Alexandrian rhetorician of the same name, who settled at Laodicea in Syria. Both father and son were distinguished as writers; they were the chief authors of the ingenious substitutes for the classics by which the Christians endeavoured to baffle Julian's intention of excluding them from the cultivation of literature;^e and the younger Apollinaris, especially, had gained a high reputation by his controversial works against various forms of heresy.^f He was honoured with the friendship of St. Athanasius,^g and in 362 was appointed to the bishoprick of Laodicea.^h

An opinion condemned by the Alexandrian Council of 362ⁱ has been wrongly identified with the error of Apollinaris, which was not put forth until later.^j It was, however, current during the last years of Athanasius, who wrote in refutation of it, although—probably from a consideration of old friendship, and of the services which Apollinaris had formerly rendered to the orthodox cause—he abstained from mentioning his name.^k

While the Arians altogether denied the existence of a human soul in Christ,^l and employed the texts which relate to his humanity as proofs of the imperfection of his higher nature, Apollinaris followed the Platonic school in dividing the nature of man into body, animal or vital soul ($\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$), and intellectual or rational soul ($\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$).^m From the variableness and sinfulness of man's rational

^d Can. iii. Baronius (381. 35) asserts that this canon, so inconsistent with the later papal pretensions, is spurious; but he is refuted by Pagi (in loc.), and Noël Alexandre (viii. 177). The last of the seven canons ascribed to the council is spurious, and of date later than 455. The 5th and 6th probably belong to a council held at Constantinople in the year after the General Council. See Schröckh, xii. 58; Routh's Script. Eccl. Opuscula, i. 422; Newman, n. on Fleury, vol. i. p. 20.

^e Schröckh (xiii. 220) points out that there must be some exaggeration as to the amount of these works—Julian's edict having been in force for so very short a period that there was no time for the formation of a very large body of such literature.

^f Schröckh, xiii. 223-5.

^g Epiph. lxxvii. 2; Socrates (ii. 46) and Sozomen (vi. 23) tell a story as to

the formation of the sect, which is clearly inconsistent with known dates.

^h Tillem. vii. 611, 790.

ⁱ Hard. i. 736.

^j See Walch, iii. 170; Schröckh, xiii. 227-8; Neand. iv. 104.

^k Ath. ad Epictetum (Opera, ii. 901, seqq.) adv. Apollin. libri ii. (of which the genuineness is doubtful); Tillem. vii. 614; Schröckh, xiii. 228, 234; Möhler, ii. 204; Newman, n. on Athan. Orat. 502. Walch (iii. 171-2) and Schröckh (xii. 222) are inclined to think that St. Athanasius did not write against Apollinarianism as such.

^l See p. 203.

^m See the account of the conference between Epiphanius and Vitalis, Apollinarian bishop of Antioch, in Epiph. lxxvii. 3; Theod. Hær. Fab. iv. 8; Walch, iii. 183; Neand. iv. 93, 104; Gieseler, i. ii. 72-3.

soul he argued that, if the Saviour had had such a soul, He must together with it have had its freedom of will, and therefore a tendency to sin; consequently (he proceeded to say), *that* part of man's nature was not assumed by the Saviour, but the Divine Logos supplied its place, controlling the evil impulses of the animal soul, of which the body is the passive instrument.ⁿ Some of the followers of Apollinaris, if not he himself, maintained that the flesh of Christ existed before his appearance in the world, and was not taken by Him of the substance of the Blessed Virgin, but was brought down from heaven—a notion for which support was sought from such texts as Joh. i. 14; iii. 13; 1 Cor. xv. 47.^o

After the death of Athanasius, Apollinaris published his opinions more openly.^p He did not suppose himself to be opposed to the Catholic faith, but rather to have discovered the true grounds on which it was to be maintained.^q Finding, however, that this view of the matter was not generally accepted, he formed a sect of his own, setting up bishops at Antioch and elsewhere;^r and, A.D. 376.

like Bardesanes and Arius, he procured currency for his doctrines by embodying them in hymns and popular songs.^s Notwithstanding the anathemas pronounced against Apollinarianism by many synods, and at last by the general council of Constantinople, its founder retained his bishoprick until his death, which took place before the year 392. The sect appears to have run into further errors, but did not long survive him.^t

ⁿ Ath. c. Apollin. i. 2; ii. 6. Justin Martyr speaks of the Saviour as having *σῶμα καὶ λόγον καὶ ψυχὴν* (Apol. ii. 10); but the meaning is evidently not Apollinarian—the distinction between *ψυχὴ* and *νοῦς* not being in the writer's thought. See Petav. de Incarn. I. vi. 6-7, 14.

^o Greg. Naz. Ep. 202 (t. ii. 168), who says that he had found this in one of the heresiarch's own writings (cf. Ep. 101, p. 87; Epiph. lxxvii. 2, 13; Theod. Hær. Fab. iv. 9; Petav. de Incarn. I. vi. 8-9). Schröckh (xiii. 236) disbelieves him (comp. Walch, iii. 160, 191-3). Möhler (ii. 265-6) has some good remarks as to the proneness of German

writers on the history of doctrines to deny the truth of all statements which do not fall in with their own theories.

^p Tillem. vii. 615-6; Newman, 302.

^q Neand. iv. 104. Yet Gregory (Ep. 101, p. 92) and Theodoret (Hær. Fab. iv. 8) say that, although he admitted the coessentiality of the Three Divine Persons, he distinguished the Spirit, Son, and Father, as respectively great, greater, and greatest.

^r Tillem. vii. 620; Schröckh, xiii. 255.

^s Soz. vi. 25.

^t Vales. n. in Sozom. vi. 25; Pagi in Baron. v. 397, 456; Tillem. vii. 623-6, 630; Schröckh, xiii. 256-7, 262.

CHAPTER V.

FROM THE END OF THE SECOND GENERAL COUNCIL TO THE
DEATH OF THEODOSIUS.

A.D. 381-395.

I. It has been mentioned that the Arian Auxentius was allowed by Valentinian to retain the important see of Milan.^a On his death, in 374, the emperor was requested to nominate an archbishop, but, agreeably to his principle of avoiding interference in spiritual affairs, he referred the choice to the people. An eager contest ensued between the Catholics and the Arians. While both parties were assembled in the principal church, and it seemed likely that their excitement would break out into deeds of violence, the governor of Liguria, Ambrose, appeared, and made a speech exhorting them to peace. When he ceased, a little child, it is said, was heard to utter the words "Ambrose, bishop!" and immediately the cry was caught up by the whole assemblage.^b The governor, who, although of Christian parentage, was yet a catechumen, wished to avoid an office so alien from his former thoughts and studies. He attempted by various devices to convince the Milanese that his character was unsuitable; he fled more than once from the city; but he was brought back, and, as Valentinian approved of the election, was consecrated within a week after his baptism.^c

Ambrose, son of a prætorian prefect of Gaul, had been educated as an advocate, and at the time of his election to the archbishoprick was thirty-four years of age.^d He forthwith set himself to make up by assiduous study for his previous neglect of theological learning.^e It would seem that, on his sudden elevation, he unsus-

^a Page 250.

^b *Vita Ambrosii*, by Paulinus (printed with St. Ambrose's Works), 6; Soc. iv. 20; Soz. vi. 24.

^c Tillemont argues that, as the Scriptural prohibition of promoting a novice was given on account of the danger of pride, it did not apply here (x. 92-3). It is amusing to contrast his remarks

on the elevation of Ambrose with those on the parallel case of Nectarius. See above, p. 264.

^d Pagi, v. 268; Tillem. x. 82.

^e Ib. 97-9. "Factum est ut prius docere inciperem quam discere. Discendum igitur mihi simul et docendum est, quoniam non vacavit ante discere." Ambr. de Offic. Ministr. I. i. 4.

pectingly yielded himself to the tendencies of that fashion of religion which he found prevailing; and from the combination of this with his naturally lofty and energetic character resulted a mixture of qualities which might almost seem incompatible—of manliness, commanding dignity, and practical sense with a fanciful mysticism and a zealous readiness to encourage and forward the growing superstitions of the age.^f “The Old and the New Testament,” it has been well said, “met in the person of Ambrose—the implacable hostility to idolatry, the abhorrence of every deviation from the established form of belief; the wise and courageous benevolence, the generous and unselfish devotion to the great interests of humanity.”^g

After the death of Valentinian, Ambrose acquired a strong influence over the mind of Gratian, for whose especial
A.D. 375. instruction he wrote some treatises.^h But in Justina, the widow of the late emperor, and mother of the younger Valentinian (whose chief residence was at Milan), he found a bitter and persevering enemy. This princess was devoted to the Arian creed, and her first disagreement with Ambrose appears to have been in 379, when he defeated her in an attempt to procure the appointment of a heretical bishop to Sirmium.ⁱ But notwithstanding this collision, when tidings reached Milan in 383 that Gratian had been murdered at Lyons by the partisans of the rebel Maximus, Justina placed her young son in the archbishop's arms, and entreated him to become his protector. Ambrose proceeded to Treves, where Maximus had fixed his court, and obtained his consent to a partition of the West—Maximus taking for himself Britain, Gaul, and Spain, while the other countries were left to Valentinian.^k

Two years later, however, a fresh contest arose. Ambrose had
A.D. 385. succeeded in extinguishing Arianism among the citizens of Milan, so that its only adherents in the place were a portion of the court and some Gothic soldiers.^l To these the arch-

^f This was not, however, without exception. On one occasion he broke down and sold his church-plate for the redemption of captives who had been carried away by barbarians. Dean Milman says (iii. 246) “Even Fleury argues that they were not consecrated vessels.” But Fleury (xvii. 39) adds that he “reserved those which were consecrated for some greater need;” and in this he is warranted by St. Ambrose himself, who says (De Offic. Ministr. ii. 28)—that unconsecrated plate is to be

used for such purposes *first*, although the consecrated may follow if required; in which case the vessels ought to be broken down, to prevent profanation. This course was afterwards sanctioned by Councils, e.g. Conc. Remense, A.D. 625 or 630, c. 22.

^g Milman, iii. 245.

^h Schröckh, xiv. 163–176; Gibbon, ii. 529.

ⁱ Paulinus, 11.

^k Soc. v. 11; Tillem. x. 153; Gibbon, ii. 529. ^l Ambr. Ep. xx. 12.

bishop was required, on the approach of Easter, to give up, first, a church without the walls, and afterwards the newest and largest church in the city. He was twice summoned before the council, who told him that he must yield to the imperial power. He replied that he was ready to part with anything that was his own—even his life; but that he was not at liberty to surrender what was sacred: “Palaces,” he said, “are for the emperor; churches are for God’s priests.”^m The populace of the city were greatly excited. They tore down the hangings which had been put up by way of preparing the churches for the reception of the emperor; they seized an Arian presbyter in the streets, and would probably have killed him, if Ambrose had not interposed to rescue him; they surrounded the palace while the archbishop was in attendance on the council. The imperial ministers entreated him to restrain his partisans; Ambrose answered that it was in his power to refrain from exciting them, but that it was in God’s hand only to appease them; that, if he were suspected of having instigated the tumult, he ought to be punished by banishment or otherwise. Even the soldiery showed a disposition to take part with the Catholics; some of them, who had been sent to occupy the new church, declared that they were come not to fight, but to join in the archbishop’s prayers. The empress at length yielded, and a heavy fine which had been laid on the traders of Milan on account of the first demonstration in favour of Ambrose was remitted.ⁿ

In the beginning of the following year an edict was issued, allowing entire freedom of religion to those who should Jan. 23, profess the creed of Rimini, and denouncing death 386. against all who should molest them.^o Soon after its publication Ambrose was required, on pain of deprivation, to argue his cause with the bishop of the Arian party, a Goth who had assumed the name of Auxentius,^p in the presence of the emperor and some lay judges; but he boldly refused, on the ground that matters of faith

^m Ep. xx. 8. In allusion to the manner in which Justina carried about her religious establishment, Ambrose says that, as the Goths had formerly lived in waggons, they now had a waggon for a church (ib. 12). Writers who censure his conduct usually overlook a somewhat important distinction—that the demand was not that he should allow the Arians to exercise their worship, but that he should transfer to them a building which belonged to the Ca-

tholics. Neander (whose admiration of Christian heroes is sometimes even stronger than his love for sectarianism) vindicates Ambrose, and supposes that if the first concession had been made, others would soon have been required. iv. 91.

ⁿ Ambr. Ep. 20; Milman, iii. 248.

^o Cod. Theod. XVI. i. 4; iv. 1; Soz. vii. 13.

^p Ambr. Sermo de Basilicis tradendis, 22, t. iii. 1014.

ought not to be submitted to such a tribunal.^a When Easter was again at hand, a fresh demand was made for the church within the walls. With an allusion to the story of Naboth, he replied that he would not give up the inheritance of his fathers, the holy and orthodox bishops who had filled the see before him. On being ordered to leave the city, he refused to yield except to force, and his flock, in fear lest he should either withdraw or be carried off, anxiously guarded him—passing several nights in the church and the adjoining buildings, while the outlets were watched by the imperial soldiers. During these vigils Ambrose introduced, for the first time in the west, a mode of singing which had lately originated in somewhat similar circumstances at Antioch^r—that, instead of leaving the psalmody to the choristers, the whole congregation should divide itself into two choirs, by which the chant was to be taken up alternately.^s

The matter was still undecided, when Ambrose, being engaged in consecrating a new church, was requested by his people to use the same ceremonies as on a certain former occasion. He answered that he would do so if relics of saints should be found, and he gave orders to dig up the pavement near the altar-rails in the church of St. Felix and St. Nabor; when two skeletons were found—of extraordinary size, “such as the olden time produced,” with the heads separated from the bodies, and a large quantity of fresh blood.^t These relics, after having been exposed for two days, were deposited in the new church. Demoniacs who were brought near to them showed signs of great disturbance; some declared that the bones were those of martyrs, and proclaimed their names, Gervasius and Protasius—names which had been utterly forgotten, but which old men were at length able to remember that they had heard in former days;^u in other cases, the demons cried out that all who refused to confess the true doctrine of the Trinity, as it was taught by Ambrose, would be tormented even as they themselves then were.^x Other miracles are related as having been wrought by the touch of the cloth which covered the relics, and even by their shadow as they were carried along. The most noted was, that a butcher, well known in Milan, who had lost his sight, recovered it on touching the hem of the pall, and for the rest of his days became sacristan of the church in which they were preserved. The general excitement was now such, that, although

^a Ep. 21.

‡ Soc. vi. 8.

Institutions Liturgiques, i. 101–5.

^s Ep. 21, with the annexed sermon “De Basilicis tradendis;” Aug. Conf. ix. 15; Bingham, XIV. i. 11; Guéranger,^t Ambr. Ep. xxii. 2, 12; Aug. Conf. ix. 16.^u Ambr. ib. 12.

” Ib. 21.

the Arians questioned and ridiculed the miracles,^y Justina no longer ventured to press her claims against the bishop, who was supposed to have been distinguished by a Divine interposition in his behalf.^z

An apprehension of renewed danger from Maximus may perhaps have contributed to this result.^a In the following year Ambrose was again sent to the court of Treves, A.D. 387. with a commission to treat for the delivery of Gratian's body. He asserted in a remarkable manner the dignity of the episcopal character, but returned without effecting his object;^b and soon after Maximus, in violation of his engagements, invaded the territories of Valentinian. The young emperor and his mother fled for protection to Theodosius, who in the summer of 388 marched westwards, defeated and killed the usurper, and for a time fixed his residence at Milan.^c

The power which Ambrose had exerted over the younger princes was no less felt by "the Great" Theodosius. Soon after his arrival at Milan, the emperor was about to seat himself within that part of the cathedral which was appropriated to the clergy, when the archbishop desired him to withdraw to a position at the

^y Ambr. ib. 17, 23.

^z I have related this affair without making any comment on it in the text. But, even if the probability of a miracle or of a series of miracles on such an occasion be granted, there are serious difficulties in the way of receiving the narrative in its entirety, with Dr. Newman (Church of the Fathers, chap. iii.; Essay on Miracles, pp. 185-200). Le Clerc, Mosheim (i. 352), Mr. Isaac Taylor (Ancient Christianity, &c. i. 475, ii. 258-271), and Mr. Henry Rogers (Essays, ii. 215-222) charge St. Ambrose with imposture. This accusation, indeed, must not be rejected merely on account of its offensiveness, without a due consideration of the very dangerous maxims which prevailed as to the lawfulness of using deceit for religious ends—a practice maintained by all the eminent teachers of the age, with the exception of St. Augustine, who held all falsehood to be unlawful for Christians. (See Chrysost. de Sacerdotio, i. 5; Cassian. Collat. xvii. 17, seqq.; Schröckh, ix. 343-358; Neander's Chrysostomus, i. 93-6; Gieseler, I. ii. 307; Gilly's Vigilantius, 266-9, with the quotation from Coleridge, p. 269; and for Augustine, his book 'Contra Mendacium';^a Dupin, iii. 227-8; Schröckh,

xv. 319.) But even if we should venture to adopt the supposition of Le Clerc and his followers, the case is still encumbered with difficulties; nor have I met with any theory which will satisfactorily remove them all. (See Schröckh, ix. 214-7; Milman, iii. 253.) Without giving any opinion on the question, I may remark that the variations between the reports as to the finding of the relics will warrant us in making large deductions from similar stories on the grounds of exaggeration and imperfect testimony. St. Augustine—who might be supposed an unexceptionable witness, since he was himself at Milan when the thing took place, while his mother was a zealous adherent of the archbishop—tells us (Confess. ix. 16) that the discovery was announced to Ambrose by a vision, and that the bodies had been preserved uncorrupted; whereas St. Ambrose himself mentions no other previous intimation than that he felt a glow (*ardor*) when the digging was begun, and it is clear from his narrative (Ep. 22) that the bodies were reduced to skeletons.

^a Dupin, ii. 252.

^b Ambr. Ep. 24; Tillem. x. 195; Schröckh, xiv. 235-7.

^c Gibbon, ii. 535-8.

head of the laity. Theodosius expressed thanks for the admonition, excused himself on the ground that at Constantinople the imperial seat was within the railings of the choir, and, on his return to the eastern capital, astonished the more courtly clergy by introducing the practice of Milan.^d

The zeal of Theodosius for unity of faith and worship among his subjects was encouraged and directed by Ambrose, A.D. 388. who assumed a right of moral control over the emperor's proceedings. On one occasion, at least, this influence appears to have been pushed beyond the bounds of equity. The Christians of Callinicum, in Mesopotamia, had destroyed a Jewish synagogue, and, in revenge for an insult offered to some monks as they were on their way to keep a festival, had also burnt a Valentinian conventicle. Theodosius ordered that the bishop of the place, who had encouraged these proceedings, should restore the buildings, or pay the price of them. On hearing of the order, Ambrose wrote to the emperor by way of remonstrance, and, as his letter had no effect, he followed it up by a personal appeal in a sermon, maintaining that it was inconsistent with the duty of a Christian prince to sanction the employment of Christian funds for such purposes. Theodosius yielded and recalled his sentence.^e We may be inclined to wonder that Ambrose, if he failed to see the injustice of the position which he advanced, and its inconsistency with any sound principles of civil government, was yet not led to suspect its truth by the consideration that it would warrant the oppression of a Christian minority by heathens, or of an orthodox minority by heretics. But so far was he from feeling any misgiving on this account, that he even ventured to cite the destruction of churches under Julian, and the recent burning of the episcopal house at Constantinople by the Arians, as if these acts were sufficient precedents for a justification of the Mesopotamian outrages.^f

An interposition of a more creditable nature followed. The most prominent defect in the noble and amiable character of Theodosius was a proneness to violent anger. That he could be merciful after great provocation was remarkably shown in his forgiveness of

^d Soc. v. 24. This incident is by some writers (as Theod. v. 18) improbably connected with the *penance* of Theodosius. See Tillem. x. 218-9; Schröckh, xiv. 256-7.

^e Ambr. Ep. xl.-xli.; Paulinus, 22-3; Baron. 388. 82-92; Gibbon, ii. 546-7.

^f Ep. xl. 13-15. Tillemont (x. 200-1) appears to rely more on parallels than

on arguments for the defence of Ambrose. Schröckh (vii. 391-3) is strongly against the archbishop. Comp. Bayle, art. *Abbas*, note C. Gregory the Great acted on a different principle in the matter of the Jews of Terracina (Epp. i. 10, 35), and in a similar case at Palermo, ix. 55.

the people of Antioch, who in 387 rose in sedition on account of a tax, burnt some houses, and threw down the statues of the emperor, his deceased wife, and others of his family.^a But in 390 his passion became the occasion of a fearful tragedy at Thessalonica. The populace of that city, on the occasion of a chariot-race, demanded the release of a favourite charioteer, whom Botheric, commander-in-chief of the district, had imprisoned for attempting an abominable crime; and on Botheric's refusal, they broke out into tumult, and murdered him with many of his soldiery and others. The emperor, although greatly exasperated by the report of the insurrection, promised, at the intercession of Ambrose, to pardon the Thessalonians; but secular advisers, by insisting on the heinous character of the offence, afterwards procured from him an order which was carefully kept secret from the bishop. The people of Thessalonica were invited to a performance of games in the circus, and, while there assembled, were attacked by an overwhelming force of soldiers. Neither age nor sex was regarded; no distinction was made between guilty and innocent, citizen and stranger. For three hours an indiscriminate butchery was carried on, and at least seven thousand victims perished.^b

On hearing of this massacre, Ambrose was filled with horror. Theodosius was then absent from Milan, and before his return the archbishop retired into the country, whence he wrote a letter,ⁱ exhorting him to repent, and declaring that, until due penance should be performed, he had been forbidden by God to offer the eucharistic sacrifice in the emperor's presence. The letter had its effect in convincing Theodosius of the guilt which he had incurred by substituting treacherous barbarity for justice. But this was not enough for Ambrose. As Theodosius was about to enter the church, the archbishop met him in the porch; laying hold of his robe, he desired him to withdraw, as a man polluted with innocent blood; and when the emperor spoke of his contrition, Ambrose told him that private regrets were insufficient to expiate so grievous a wrong. Theodosius submitted and retired. For eight months he remained in penitential seclusion, laying aside all his imperial ornaments, until at the Christmas season he presented himself before the archbishop, and humbly entreated readmission into the Church. Ambrose required some practical fruit of his repentance, and the emperor consented to issue a law by which, in order to

^a Soz. vii. 23; Theod. v. 20; Tillem. v. 17). Some writers reckon the number at more than 15,000. Gibbon, ii. Emp. v. 263-280; Gibbon, ii. 544.

^b This is the lowest estimate (Theod. 545. ⁱ Ep. 51.

guard against the effects of sudden passion, the execution of all capital punishments was to be deferred until thirty days after the sentence.^k He was then allowed to enter the church. He prostrated himself on the pavement with every demonstration of the deepest grief and humiliation; and Ambrose, in his funeral oration over the emperor, assures us that from that time he never passed a day without recalling to mind the crime into which he had been betrayed by his passion.^l

The behaviour of Theodosius in this remarkable affair was evidently not the result of weakness or pusillanimity, but of a real feeling of his guilt—a sincere acknowledgment of a higher Power to which all worldly greatness is subject. In order to judge rightly of Ambrose's conduct, we must dismiss from our minds some recollections of later times, which may be very likely to intrude themselves. The archbishop appears to have been actuated by no other motive than a solemn sense of his duty. He felt the dignity with which his office invested him; he held himself bound, by interposing it in behalf of justice and humanity, to control the power of earthly sovereignty. His sternness towards the emperor has nothing in common with the assumptions of those who, in after ages, used the names of God and his Church to cover their own pride and selfish ambition.

In the autumn of 391 Theodosius returned to the East, leaving Valentinian in possession, not only of his original dominions, but of those which had been ceded to Maximus after the murder of Gratian. Justina had died in 388, and from that time the young emperor was entirely under the guidance of Ambrose.^m In 392 he wrote from Vienne, urgently desiring the archbishop to visit him—partly in order to establish a better relation with the Frankish general Arbogastes, who had been placed with him by Theodosius as a protector, but had begun to show symptoms of a dangerous ambition; and partly to administer the sacrament of baptism, which Valentinian, according to the custom of the time, had hitherto delayed to receive. Ambrose set out in obedience to the summons; but before his arrival, Valentinian had been murdered by the Frank.ⁿ Once more Theodosius

May 15,
392.

^k Cod. Theod. IX. xl. 13.

^l Ambr. in Obit. Theod. 34 (t. II. i. 1396); Soz. vii. 24-5; Theod. v. 18; Baron. 390. 2-30; Tillem. x. 209-215; Schröckh, xiv. 250-260; Gibbon, ii. 544-8; Milman, iii. 258, seqq.

^m Tillem. x. 243.

ⁿ Till. x. 244; Emp. v. 350. He was

buried at Milan, and Ambrose preached a funeral sermon. "On this occasion," says Gibbon (ii. 551), "the humanity of Ambrose tempted him to make a singular breach in his theological system; and to comfort the weeping sisters of Valentinian, by the firm assurance, that their pious brother, though he had not

moved into the west, to put down the rhetorician Eugenius, whom Arbogastes had raised to a nominal sovereignty. But within four months after his victory he died at Milan—the last emperor who fully maintained the dignity of the Roman name.^o Ambrose survived him a little more than two years—dying on Easter-eve, 397.^p

II. Although paganism lost the ascendancy which it had possessed during the brief reign of Julian, it yet for a time enjoyed full toleration.^q While barbarians threatened the empire, its rulers felt the inexpediency of irritating that large portion of their subjects which adhered to the old religion. Valentinian and his brother, indeed, carried on a searching inquiry after the practice of magical arts, and punished those concerned in it severely—in many cases with death.^r But the edicts on this subject were only renewals of earlier laws;^s and the motive of them was not religious but political, inasmuch as the practices of divination and theurgy were connected with speculations and intrigues as to matters of state. These practices were carried on, not by the ignorant vulgar alone, but by members of the old Roman aristocracy, and by the high philosophic party which had been influential under Julian; and many persons both of the aristocratic and of the philosophical classes were among the victims of Valentinian's laws.^t The consultation of the aruspices for innocent purposes was, however, still allowed.^u Guards of soldiers were employed to protect the temples, although Christians were exempt from this service.^x Valentinian even bestowed on the priesthood privileges exceeding those which they had received from his heathen predecessors, and in some respects greater than those which the Christians enjoyed;^y and the orthodox

received the sacrament of baptism, was introduced, without difficulty, into the mansions of eternal bliss." Surely there is nothing inconsistent with Ambrose's system in arguing, as he here does (*De Obitu Valent.* 51-3), that a person who was cut off by a violent death, while preparing for baptism and earnestly desiring it, might be judged of in the same way as those who were martyred in their catechumenate. See Bingham, *Lett. I.* on Absolution, Works, vol. ii. p. 275, folio.

^o Gibbon, ii. 539-540.

^p Tillem. x. 365; Pagi in Baron. vi. 240.

^q Amm. Marcell. xxx. 9; Neand. iii. 96-9; Beugnot, i. 233.

^r Cod. Theod. IX. xvi. 7-8; Amm.

Marc. xxix. 2. Magical books were condemned to destruction, and many works of other kinds unhappily perished through being confounded with them. Schröckh, vii. 31.

^s Beugnot, i. 244.

^t Among them was Maximus (see p. 238), who was especially obnoxious because, in the reign of Julian, he had denounced Valentinian as disrespectful to the gods. Zosim. iv. 1, 2, 15; Baron. 364. 17; 370. 99-102; Tillem. Emp. v. 6-10, 110; Gibbon, ii. 389, 394-7; Beugnot, i. 247, seqq.; Milman, iii. 112-8.

^u Cod. Theod. IX. xvi. 9.

^x Ib. XVI. i. 1.

^y Schröckh, vii. 203; Beugnot, i. 234.

subjects of Valens complained that, while they themselves were subjected to banishment and disabilities on account of their faith, the heathens were freely allowed to practise all the rites of their idolatry—even the impure and frantic worship of Bacchus.^z In 364 Valentinian forbade nocturnal sacrifices; but, on receiving a representation that the Greeks could not endure to be deprived of their mysteries, he exempted these from the operation of his law.^a At a later period, Valentinian and Valens were induced, by political causes, to prohibit all animal sacrifices; yet the other rites of heathen worship were still permitted, and at Rome, where paganism was strong, the edict was not enforced.^b

Under Theodosius and the contemporary emperors of the West there was a more decided movement for the suppression of paganism. In 381, and again in 385, Theodosius renewed the laws against sacrifices.^c In 386 he sent Cynegius, the prefect of the East, into Egypt, with a commission to shut up the temples.^d But while the law spared the buildings themselves, the zeal of Christians very often exceeded it. So long as the temples were standing, they alarmed one party with the apprehension, and flattered the other with the hope, that a second Julian might arise.^e Many of them were destroyed in consequence—some under the pretext (true or false) that sacrifice had been illegally offered in them.^f The work of demolition was chiefly incited or executed by monks; in countries where these did not abound—such as Greece—the splendid monuments of heathen architecture were allowed to remain, whether disused, employed as churches, or converted to secular purposes.^g The celebrated sophist Libanius in 384 composed a plea for the temples, which has the form of a speech delivered before the emperor, although it was probably never even presented to him in writing.^h The orator complains of “black-garbed men, more voracious than elephants, and insatiably thirsty, although veiling their sensuality under an artificial paleness;” that, although the law forbade no part of paganism except bloody sacrifices, these monks went about committing acts of outrage and plunder; that they treated the priests with violence; that they even seized lands under the pretence that they had been

^z Soc. iv. 16; Theod. iv. 24; v. 31.

^a Zosim. iv. 3; Beugnot, i. 244.

^b Libanius de Templis, ed. Reiske, t. ii. pp. 103, 181, quoted by Gieseler, I. ii. 23-4. (This Oration is not in Morel's edition.)

^c Cod. Theod. XVI. x. 7, 9.

^d Zosim. iv. 37; Idatius, A.D. 388

(Patrol. lxxiv.); Beugnot, i. 360.

^e Gibbon, iii. 10.

^f Neand. iii. 104.

^g Gibbon, iii. 11; Gieseler, I. ii. 25; Beugnot, i. 361; Milman, iii. 161.

^h Tillem. Emp. v. 232-3; Neand. iii. 107; Milman, n. on Gibbon, iii. 10.

connected with illegal rites; and that, if appeal were made to "the shepherds in the cities" (*i. e.* the bishops), the complainants, instead of obtaining any redress, were told that they had been only too gently treated. He traces all the calamities of the time to the change of religion. He appeals to the New Testament precepts in proof that the forcible measures of the Christians were contrary to the spirit which their own faith inculcated. He endeavours to alarm the superstition of his readers, by saying that the service of the ancient deities was still kept up in Egypt, because the Christians themselves feared to risk the fertility of the country by suppressing it.ⁱ

In no long time this last assertion was put to the test. Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, a violent man, whose name will be often mentioned hereafter, obtained a grant of a temple of Bacchus, and ordered the site to be excavated with a view to building a church on it. Indecent symbols used in the worship of Bacchus were found among the ruins, and were publicly paraded in mockery. The offended pagans rose in insurrection, killed a number of Christians, and shut themselves up in the temple of Serapis, which, with its precincts, formed a vast pile of building, and was regarded as one of the wonders of the world.^k They made sallies from time to time, slew some Christians, and carried off many prisoners, whom they either compelled to sacrifice, or, in case of refusal, subjected to cruel tortures; some were even crucified. On receiving a report of the matter from the governor of Alexandria, the emperor answered, that, as the Christians who had been slain were martyrs, those who had been concerned in their death were not to be punished, but rather, if possible, were to be attracted to the true faith by clemency; but he ordered that the temples of Alexandria should be destroyed. The Serapeum was deserted by its defenders, who had been induced by the governor to attend the public reading of the imperial rescript, and had fled in consternation on hearing the sentence against the temples. The idol of Serapis, the tutelary deity of the city, was of enormous size, and was adorned with jewels and with plates of gold and silver. There was a popular belief that, if it were injured, heaven and earth would go to wreck, and even Christians looked on with anxiety, when a soldier, mounting a ladder, raised his axe against the figure. But when it was seen that with impunity he first struck off a cheek, and then cleft one of the knees, the spell was

ⁱ Lib. ed. Reiske, t. ii. pp. 164, 168, 181, quoted by Gieseler, I. ii. 24-6. 13. ^k Amm. Marc. xxii. 16; Gibbon, iii.

at an end. The head of the god was thrown down, and a swarm of rats rushed forth from it, exciting the disgust and derision of the crowd.¹ The idol was soon broken into pieces, which were dragged into the amphitheatre and burnt. On examining the temple a discovery was made of infamies by which it had been polluted, and of tricks by which the priests had imposed on the credulity of the worshippers; and in consequence of this exposure many persons were converted to the Church. The pagan party, however, began to exult when it was found that the rising of the Nile was that year delayed beyond its usual time. The emperor was consulted: "Better," he answered, "that it should not rise at all, than that we should buy the fertility of Egypt by idolatry." At length the river swelled to a more than ordinary height, and the pagans began to hope that Serapis would avenge himself by an inundation; but they soon had the mortification of seeing the waters subside to their proper level. The temple of the god was demolished, and a church was built on its site, while the other buildings of the Serapeum were preserved.^m In obedience to the emperor's command, the temples were destroyed at Alexandria and throughout Egypt. The statues were burnt or melted down, with the exception of one, which, we are told, Theophilus preserved as an evidence against paganism, lest the adherents of that system should afterwards deny that they had worshipped objects so contemptible.ⁿ

The old religion was more powerful in the West than in the East. Most of the high Roman families clung to it—not, apparently, from any conviction of its truth, but from a feeling of pride in maintaining the traditions of their ancestors, and from unwillingness to undertake the labour of inquiry. A profession of paganism was no bar to the attainment of high offices in the state; and with these the Roman nobles, like their forefathers, ambitiously sought to combine the dignities of the pagan hierarchy.^o In the capital a vast number of temples and of smaller religious edifices was still devoted to the ancient worship;^p while in the rural dis-

¹ Min. Felix had argued against heathenism from the liberties which birds, &c., took with the images of the gods. Octavius, c. 24.

^m Matter, *Écoles d'Alexandrie*, ii. 321, seqq.

ⁿ Rufin. ii. 22-30; Soc. v. 16, 20; Soz. vii. 15; Theod. v. 22; Gibbon, iii. 13-6. Socrates says that the excepted statue was that of Jupiter; others, that it was a monkey. Tillem. Emp. v. 322.

^o Beugnot, i. 342-3, 395, 411.

^p See the 'Notitia Urbis,' in Patrol. xviii. 450, seqq. Gibbon says 424 (iii. 4). Count A. de Beugnot (i. 266) reckons up 152 temples and 183 chapels. But, on the one hand, we cannot know how many lesser buildings were contained in the great *ædes*; on the other, what number of the edifices were then in actual use (ib. 268).

tricts of Italy the system was maintained by the connexion of its deities with every incident in the round of agricultural labours. Bishops are found reproaching the Christian landowners with the indifference which, disregarding everything but money, allowed the population of their estates to continue in the undisturbed practice of idolatry.¹ Throughout the western provinces generally, the old barbarian religions prevailed in some places; the worship of the Roman gods in others.² From the fact that many bishopricks of the West are traced to the period between A.D. 350 and 380, it has been inferred that an organised attack on paganism was then first attempted in those regions.³

Gratian, in his earlier years, maintained the principle of religious equality; but the influence of St. Ambrose afterwards produced an important change in his policy, so that this young emperor inflicted heavier blows on paganism than any which his predecessors had ventured to attempt.⁴ There was in the senate-house at Rome an altar of Victory, at which the senators took the oath of fidelity to the emperor and the laws, and on which libations and incense were offered at the beginning of every meeting.⁵ The removal of this altar was the only considerable act by which Constantius interfered with the religion of the capital; but it was restored by Julian, and continued to hold its place until, in 382, Gratian ordered that it should be again removed. A body of senators, headed by Symmachus, the most eloquent orator of his time—a man of eminent personal character, and distinguished by the highest civil and religious offices⁶—proceeded to Milan for the purpose of requesting that the altar might be replaced. But the Christian party in the senate had already prepossessed the emperor's mind by means of Damasus and Ambrose; and he refused to see the envoys.⁷ At the same time he deprived the temples of their lands, withdrew from them all public funds, rendered it illegal to bequeath real property to them, and stripped the vestals and the priests of religious and civil privileges.⁸ Then perhaps it may have been, and with the hope of effectually appealing to his

¹ *e.g.* Zeno of Verona, I. xv. 6 (Patrol. xi. 364); Gaudentius, of Brescia, Serm. 13 (ib. xx. 940); Beugnot, i. 283-290.

² See Beugnot, i. 290, seqq.

³ Beugnot, i. 318; who supposes that a break in an episcopal line denotes a temporary local ascendancy of paganism, i. 282.

⁴ *Ib.* i. 326.

⁵ Gibbon, iii. 4; Beugnot, i. 410.

⁶ See Patrol. xxviii. (where his works are printed) 14-6; Beugnot, l. viii. c. 7; Ozanam, i. 137.

⁷ Ambros. Ep. xvii. 10; Schröckh, vii. 51-2.

⁸ Honorius refers to this edict, Cod. Theod. XVI. x. 20. See too the pleadings of Symmachus and Ambrose; Ambr. de Obitu Valentiniani, 19-20; Tillem. Emp. vii. 169-170; Beugnot, i. 328.

feelings, that a deputation of the priesthood displayed before him the robe of the Pontifex Maximus—a dignity which had been held by all his predecessors, as well since as before the conversion of Constantine. But he rejected it as unbecoming a Christian.^a

In 384 a fresh attempt was made on the young Valentinian. Symmachus appeared at Milan as the chief of a deputation, and delivered to the emperor an eloquent written pleading on behalf of the altar of Victory and the old religion.^b He drew a distinction between the emperor's personal conviction and his position as the ruler of a state which for centuries had worshipped the gods of paganism. He dwelt on the omens connected with the name of Victory, and traced the famines, wars, and other calamities of recent years to the anger of the gods on account of the withholding of their dues. He urged that it was an unworthy act to withdraw the funds by which the pagan worship had been maintained. He personified Rome addressing the emperor as a mother, reminding him of her ancient glories, and professing herself unable to learn any other religion than that by which she had acquired her greatness.

Ambrose, who, on hearing of the application of the pagan party, had written to the emperor,^c earnestly exhorting him to refuse it, followed up his letter by a formal and elaborate reply to Symmachus.^d He argued that it was unlawful for a Christian sovereign to countenance a system which he must believe to be hateful to God. It would, he said, be a wrong to the Christian senators if they were compelled to take a part in the sacrifices to Victory; and they must be considered as sharing in the acts of the senate whether they were personally present or not. He met the plea as to the misfortunes of the empire by referring to those of princes who had professed idolatry. The ancient glories of Rome could not have been derived from the worship of the gods; for her conquered enemies had been of the same religion. Her hoary age would become not less but more venerable by her embracing the truth of the Gospel. Christianity had grown under oppression, whereas paganism, according to the statement of its own advocates,

^a Zosim. iv. 36. See Schröckh, vii. 206; Beugnot, i. 329-330; Gieseler, I. ii. 24. The refusal of the robe is more commonly placed in the beginning of the reign, and it is said, on the evidence of coins, &c., that Gratian nevertheless retained the title of Pontifex Maximus. (Neand. iii. 100.) But Beugnot (i. 341) and Gieseler show that there is no proof of his having held the title after refus-

ing the robe, and that *both* were probably rejected in his latter days. The view of Tillemont (Emp. v. 138-9), and other older writers, that the title, though *given* to the earlier Christian emperors, was not *accepted* by them, appears to be unfounded.

^b See Symm. Ep. x. 61, or Ambros. t. II. ii. 966.

^c Ep. xvii.

^d Ep. xviii.

depended for its very life on the endowments and emoluments of the priesthood. Heathenism found a difficulty in keeping up the number of its seven vestals, notwithstanding the high privileges attached to the order, whereas multitudes of Christian women had voluntarily chosen a virgin life of poverty and mortification. And what deeds of charity had heathenism to produce against the maintenance of the needy, the redemption of captives, and other such things which were the daily work of Christians?

In reading these rival pleadings, we cannot but be struck by the remarkable contrast in tone between the apologetic diffidence of Symmachus, and the triumphant assurance of Ambrose, who, in his previous letter to the emperor, had gone so far as to say that if he made the required concession to idolatry, the Church would reject him and his offerings.^e It is evident that, apart from all consideration of the value of their respective arguments, the Christian champion has gained his cause, and that the petition of Symmachus must be—as it was—unsuccessful.^f

The pagan party next applied to Theodosius, when in Italy after the death of Maximus. The emperor was at first inclined to yield, but Ambrose swayed him as he had A.D. 389. swayed the younger prince.^g Once more a deputation was sent to Valentinian in Gaul, when he was at a distance both from his colleague and from the Archbishop; but this attempt was also a failure.^h

In 392, an important law was issued by Theodosius for the whole empire. With an elaborate specification it includes all persons, of every rank and in every place. Sacrifice and divination, even although performed without any political object, are to be regarded as treasonable, and to be capitally punished. The use of lights, incense, garlands, or libations, and other such lesser acts of idolatry, are to involve the forfeiture of the houses or lands where they are committed. Heavy fines, graduated according to the position of the parties, are denounced against those who should enter temples; if magistrates offend in this respect, and their officers do not attempt to prevent them, the officers are also to be fined.ⁱ

The severity of this enactment probably contributed to swell

^e Ep. xvii. 14. He refers to it again, Ep. lvii. 2.

^f It was, however, circulated as the manifesto of the pagan party, and Prudentius wrote two books in verse against it. *Patrol.* lx. 111, seqq.; Arevalo, *ib.*

lix. 614; Ozanam, *Civil. Chrétienne au 5^{me} Siècle*, ii. 249.

^g Ambr. Ep. lvii. 4.

^h Ambr. Ep. lvii. 5; Beugnot, i. 434.

ⁱ *Cod. Theod.* XVI. x. 12.

the party of Eugenius, whom the pagans hailed as a deliverer.^k

Whether he himself apostatised is uncertain; but his

A.D. 392-4. master, Arbogastes, was avowedly a pagan, and during the short period of the rhetorician-emperor's power, the altar of Victory was replaced, the rites of the old religion were revived in all their completeness, and the confiscated property of the temples was restored.^l It has been said that Theodosius, on visiting Rome after the defeat of Eugenius, referred the choice between Christianity and paganism to the vote of the senate, and that the Gospel was adopted by a majority;^m but the story is exceedingly improbable,ⁿ and is perhaps no more than an exaggeration founded on some discussion which took place at Milan between the emperor and a deputation of the senate.^o

It is not correct to say—as has sometimes been said—that paganism was *suppressed* by Theodosius. Its adherents, although debarred from the exercise of its rites, were allowed to enjoy perfect freedom of thought, and the dignities of the state were open to them.^p The execution of the laws against it was very partial; as they were exceeded where the Christian party was strong, so where that party was weak they were not enforced.^q At Rome, the emperor himself was complimented, like his predecessors, by being enrolled among the gods at his death.^r But yet the old system was evidently doomed. Its remaining strength was not in belief but in habit. The withdrawal of public funds told on it to a degree which would have been impossible if there had been any principle of life in it. The priests, when attacked, succumbed in a manner which indicated an utter want of faith and zeal. Although paganism was common among men of letters, no one of these attempted theological controversy; their efforts in

^k Beugnot, i. 406-9. M. de Beugnot supposes, but only by way of conjecture, that the usurper Maximus had before been supported by the pagans, i. 399.

^l Ambr. Ep. lvii.; Beugnot, i. 436; Gieseler, I. ii. 29.

^m Prudent. c. Symmach. i. 609-616; Zosimus, iv. 5, 9; v. 38 (who, however, says that the Senators were all against the change, and that Theodosius enforced it).

ⁿ (1) It is all but certain that Theodosius did not visit Rome at the time in question (Pagi in Baron. vi. 185)—a difficulty which has led some writers to refer the incident to his visit after the defeat of Maximus, A.D. 388-9. (Tillem.

Emp. v. 304; Gibbon, iii. 7-8.) (2) The question was too important to be entrusted to the senate of those days, when that body had become insignificant. (3) A prince so zealous as Theodosius would hardly have left it to the risk of a vote. See these and other objections in Beugnot, i. 484-7. Comp. Arevalo in Patrol. lix. 615; lx. 171; Milman, n. on Gibbon, iii. 7; Neand. iii. 111; Gieseler, I. ii. 29.

^o Beugnot, i. 487; Comp. Tillem. Emp. v. 393.

^p Gibbon, iii. 20-1.

^q Beugnot, i. 362-3, 394.

^r See Claudian de Tert. Consul. Honorii, 162, seqq.; Beugnot, i. 487-8.

behalf of their religion did not reach beyond pleadings for toleration.^a St. Jerome speaks of the temples at Rome about this time as left to neglect, disorder, and decay.^t

III. Among those of his subjects who professed Christianity, Theodosius was resolved to establish unity of religion. Immediately after the conclusion of the General Council of July 30, Constantinople, he ordered that all churches should be ^{381.} given up to the Catholics, that no meetings of heretics should be held, and that no buildings should be erected for such meetings.^u In 383 he summoned a conference of bishops of all parties, with the hope of bringing them to an agreement;^x but the difference of creeds was found irreconcilable, and in the same year the emperor issued fresh edicts against the Arians. During the remaining years of the reign, frequent laws^y were directed against heresy—a term which was now no longer restricted to the denial of the leading doctrines of the faith, but was applied also to lesser errors of doctrine and to separation from the communion of the Church.^z The especial objects of the emperor's animosity were

^a Gibbon, iii. 19; Schröckh, vii. 222-3.

^t Ep. cvii. 1-2.

^u Cod. Theod. XVI. i. 3.

^x Soc. v. 10; Soz. vii. 12. An incident which Sozomen (vii. 6) connects with the first arrival of Theodosius at Constantinople is supposed by Baronius (383. 31) and Tillemont (vi. 627, 802) to belong to the time of this conference. The Catholics, it is said, were afraid lest the emperor should admit Eunomius to an interview, and should be won by the heretic's specious discourse. While things were in this state, the bishops went to pay their respects at court. One of them, who is described by Sozomen as an old and homely man, bishop of an inconsiderable town, after having saluted Theodosius with great reverence, turned to the heir of the empire, Arcadius, who had lately been declared Augustus, stroked his head, and spoke to him as if he were a boy of ordinary rank. The emperor, indignant at this disrespect, ordered that the bishop should be turned out; whereupon the old man told him that even so would the Heavenly Father be offended with those who refuse to his Son the honour which they pay to Himself. Theodosius begged the bishop's forgiveness, and the Arians were kept at a distance. Theodoret places this after the defeat of Maximus,

and names Amphilochius, of Iconium, as the bishop in question (v. 16). Valois (n. on Soz. vii. 6) and Tillemont (vi. 627) point out that Sozomen's description does not suit Amphilochius, or his see. "Yet," says Gibbon (ii. 517), "I must take leave to think that both Amphilochius and Iconium were objects of inconsiderable magnitude in the Roman empire." But objects which appeared inconsiderable to Mr. Gibbon may have been very differently esteemed by the Byzantine writer. It seems more likely either that Sozomen erred in describing the bishop, or Theodoret in naming him, than that their accounts should relate to two different affairs—as Valois (loc. cit.) and Schröckh (xii. 67-70) appear to suppose.

^y Theodosius published fifteen such edicts in the same number of years (A.D. 381-394), Cod. Theod. XVI. v. 6 seqq.

^z The so-called 6th Canon of the Council of Constantinople (see above, p. 265, n. ^d) includes among heretics "those who, although professing a sound faith, form congregations separate from the canonical bishops;" and a law of Arcadius, A.D. 395, those who "*vel levi argumento a iudicio Catholicæ religionis et tramite detecti fuerint deviare*" (Cod. Theod. XVI. v. 38). In earlier times, the Catholics sought to

Arians, Eunomians, Macedonians, Apollinarians, and Manichæans. By various enactments, he deprived them of all right to assemble for worship either in cities or in the country; he confiscated all places in which they should hold meetings; he rendered them incapable of inheriting or bequeathing property, and inflicted other civil disabilities; he forbade them to dispute on religion; he condemned those who should either confer or receive sectarian ordination to pay a penalty of ten pounds weight of gold—equal to about 400*l.* of our money.^a Against some classes of heretics he denounced confiscation and banishment; the “elect” of the Manichæans were even sentenced to death.^b

Repulsive as such legislation is to the feelings of those who have learnt to acknowledge the impossibility of enforcing religious belief, the effect in a great measure answered the emperor’s expectations. Neither heathenism nor sectarianism had much inward strength to withstand the pressure of the laws which required conformity to the Church. Crowds of proselytes flocked in, and, amidst the satisfaction of receiving these accessions, it was little asked whether in very many cases the apparent conversion were anything better than a mask for hypocrisy or indifference.^c

It would seem that the severest edicts of Theodosius were intended only to terrify, and were never actually executed.^d But the example of inflicting death as the punishment of religious error had already been given in that part of the empire which was subject to the usurper Maximus.

Priscillian was a Spaniard—well-born, rich, learned, eloquent, and skilful in disputation. His doctrines were partly derived through Elpidius, a rhetorician, and Agape, a lady of condition,^e from an Egyptian named Mark, who had travelled into Spain.^f They are described as a compound of various heresies—Manichæism, Gnosticism, Arianism, Photinianism, and Sabellianism—to which was added the practice of astrology and magic.^g That

bring home some heresy to schismatics; now, schism was itself heresy (Schröckh, ix. 311-2; Planck, i. 465). The orthodoxy of the Novatianists and of the Luciferians, however, still procured for the remnants of these sects an exemption from the severity of the new edicts. Tillem. Emp. v. 400, 716.

^a Gibbon, ii. 525.

^b Cod. Theod. XVI. v. 9, where they are styled *Encratitæ*, *Succophori*, and *Hydroparastatæ*.

^c Soz. vii. 20; Tillem. ix. 441.

^d Gibbon, ii. 526; Schröckh, xii. 61; Planck, i. 465; Milman, iii. 408-411.

^e See Matter, iii. 36-8, as to the part which women played in the formation of Gnostic sects.

^f Sulp. Sev. Hist. Sac. ii. 46.

^g Ibid.; Aug. adv. Hæreses, 70; Leo, Ep. 15, init.; Tillem. viii. 491-2; Walch, iii. 432, 461-9, 475-9; Neand. iv. 498-500; Matter, iii. 96. M. Matter infers from a comparison of Sulp. Severus with

he held a dualistic principle, appears certain.^h He admitted the whole canon of Scripture, but by allegory, or by alteration of the text, overcame the difficulties of such parts as did not agree with his system; and he relied mainly on some apocryphal writings.ⁱ His followers are said to have regarded falsehood as allowable for the purpose of concealing their real tenets;^k they attended the churches, and received the eucharistic elements, but did not consume them.^l Priscillian's precepts were rigidly ascetic; he prescribed separation for married persons; but, like other heresiarchs, he is charged with secretly teaching sensuality and impurity.^m

It was about the year 378 that the progress of Priscillianism, especially among the female sex, began to attract notice,ⁿ and in 380-1 it was condemned by a council of Spanish and Aquitanian bishops at Saragossa. Two bishops, however, Salvian and Instantius, took part with Priscillian, and, being reinforced by Hyginus of Cordova, who had once been a vehement opponent of his views, they consecrated him to the see of Avila.^o The opposite party appealed to the secular power, and, by order of Gratian, the heresiarch and his consecrators were banished from Spain.^p With the hope of obtaining a reversal of this sentence, Priscillian set out for Rome, in company with Salvian and Instantius. In their progress through Aquitania they gained many proselytes, especially at the episcopal city of Elusa (Eauze). At Bordeaux the bishop prevented their entrance into the town, but they found a welcome in the neighbourhood from Euchrotia, the widow of a distinguished poet and orator named Delphidius; and as they moved onwards they were attended by her, with her daughter Procula, and a numerous train of female converts.^q On arriving at Rome they were unable to obtain an audience of Damasus, and there Salvian died. His companions, returning northward, found themselves opposed at Milan by the influence of Ambrose; but, by means of bribes and solicitations to persons in high office, they procured from Gratian an order for their restoration to their sees. The proconsul of Spain was won by similar means, and Ithacius and Ida-

St. Jerome, that the so-called *magic* was rather *Magianism*, p. 97.

^h Walch, iii. 462; Matter, iii. 99.

ⁱ Aug. Hær. 70; Matter, iii. 99.

^k Tillem. viii. 495. See Schlegel, in Mosh. i. 412; Schröckh, xi. 316; Neand. iv. 501. Augustine's treatise, 'Contra Mendacium,' was written against some Catholics who were for meeting the falsehoods of the Priscillianists and detecting them by pretending to join the

sect. See c. 2.

^l Can. Cæsaraug. iii. ap. Hard. i. 806.

^m Sulp. Sev. ii. 48; Aug. Hær. 70; Walch, iii. 467; Gibbon, ii. 527; Matter, iii. 104-5.

ⁿ Tillem. viii. 498. See Walch, iii. 87.

^o Sulp. Sev. Hist. Sac. ii. 47.

^p Ib.; Walch, iii. 390-2.

^q Sulp. Sev. ii. 48; Tillem. viii. 502; Bayle, art. 'Priscillien,' n. C.

cius, the leaders of the opposite party, were banished from that country as disturbers of the public peace.^r

During the remainder of Gratian's reign, Ithacius, a bold and able man, but of sensual and worldly habits,^s found himself unable to contend against the corruption by which the Priscillianists influenced the court. When, however, his case appeared desperate, fresh hopes were excited by the report that Maximus had been proclaimed in Britain; and, when the usurper was established at Treves, after the murder of Gratian, Ithacius brought the question

before him. Maximus referred it to a council, which was
A.D. 384. held at Bordeaux. By this assembly Instantius was first heard, and was condemned; whereupon Priscillian, when required to defend himself, appealed to the emperor, and the council allowed the appeal.^t

Priscillian and his accusers repaired to Treves, where Martin, bishop of Tours, the "Apostle of the Gauls,"—famed for his sanctity, his miracles, and his successful exertions against idolatry^u—arrived about the same time. Martin repeatedly implored Ithacius to desist from prosecuting the heretics before a secular tribunal, on which Ithacius told him that he too was a Priscillianite. Martin also represented to the emperor that the trial of an ecclesiastical offence before secular judges was unexampled, and entreated that the matter might be settled in the usual way, by the deposition of the leading heretics from their sees, according to the ecclesiastical condemnation which had been passed on them.^x His influence was powerful enough to delay the trial while he remained at Treves, and on taking leave of Maximus he obtained a promise that the lives of the accused should be safe.^y But the usurper was afterwards induced—it is said, by the hope of seizing on Priscillian's property—to depart from this resolution.^z The heretics were brought to trial, and by the use of torture were wrought to a confession of impure doctrines and practices.^a Ithacius, after having urged on the prosecution with great bitterness until the case was

^r Sulp. Sev. ii. 48; Tillem. viii. 503-4.

^s Sulp. Sev. ii. 50; Bayle, art. 'Prisc.,' n. D.

^t "Permissumque id nostrorum inconstantia, qui aut sententiam in refragantem ferre debuerant, aut, si ipsi suspecti habebantur, aliis episcopis audientiam reservare, non causam imperatori de tam manifestis criminibus permittere." Sulp. Sev. ii. 49.

^u See Sulp. Severus, 'Vita Martini,' and Dialogues; also Tillem. x. 310, seqq.

^x Sulp. Sev. ii. 50. "Benignidad," says Mariana, "que debia ser a propósito de aquel tempo, pero que la experiencia y mayor conocimiento de las cosas ha declarado seria perjudicial para el nuestro."—iii. 224.

^y Walch, iii. 399; Schröckh, xi. 324-5.

^z Pacatus, Paneg. in Theodosium, 29 (Patrol. xiii. 504); Neand. iv. 494.

^a Maximus ad Siricium, Patrol. xiii. 592; Sulp. Sev. i. 50.

virtually decided, devolved the last formal part of the work on a lay advocate—professing that his own episcopal character forbade him to proceed in a cause of blood. Priscillian, Euchrotia, and five of their companions were beheaded. Instantius was banished to the Scilly Islands, and others of the party were sentenced to banishment or confiscation.^b

Martin again visited the court of Maximus in order to plead for the lives of some of Gratian's officers, at a time when a number of bishops were assembled for the consecration of Felix to the see of Treves. These bishops, with only one exception, freely communicated with the instigators of the late proceedings, who, fearing the influence of Martin, attempted, although unsuccessfully, to prevent his entering the city. Maximus endeavoured, by elaborate attentions, to draw him into communicating with Ithacius and his party; but the bishop of Tours firmly refused, and they parted in anger. Late at night, Martin was informed that orders had been given for the execution of the officers in whom he was interested, and that two military commissioners were about to be sent into Spain, with orders to extirpate Priscillianism. The information struck him with dismay, not only on account of the peril to Gratian's adherents, but because, from the manner in which he himself and others had been charged with Priscillianism by Ithacius, he knew that the imputation of that heresy would be used as a pretext against orthodox persons of ascetic life; in great anxiety, he made his way to the emperor's presence, and, on condition that Gratian's officers should be spared, and that the commission against Priscillianism should be revoked, he promised to communicate with the Ithacians. Martin shared, accordingly, in the consecration of Felix next day, but refused to sign the act, and immediately left Treves. It is related that, as he was on his way homewards, thinking sadly on his late compliance, an angel appeared to him, who consoled him, but told him that he had acted wrongly. From that time, says his biographer, Martin felt in himself an abatement of the power of miracles; and for the remaining sixteen years of his life he avoided all councils and assemblies of bishops.^c

The execution of Priscillian and his companions was regarded with general horror, alike by Christians and by pagans.^d St.

^b Sulp. Sev. ii. 51; Bayle, 'Prisc.,' n. D.; Gibbon, ii. 527.

^c Sulp. Sev. Dialog. iii. 15; Tillem. viii. 511-2; x. 327-330. Mr. Clinton (vol. i. 513) would read *undecim* for "*sedecim annos*," in Sulpicius, and, instead

of the usual dates for Martin's visit to Treves and his death—384 and 400—gives 386 and 397. Comp. i. 539; ii. 447.

^d E. g. Sulp. Sev. Hist. Sac. ii. 50-1; and the pagan panegyrist Pacatus, c. 29.

Ambrose, when on his second mission to Treves,^e chose rather to risk and forfeit his object than to communicate with
 A.D. 387. Maximus and the bishops who had been concerned in the deed of blood.^f Siricius, bishop of Rome, joined in the condemnation of the Ithacians; and their leader was deposed, and died in exile.^g

Priscillianism did not at once become extinct. The Church of France was long disturbed by dissensions which arose out of it. The heresiarch's body was carried into Spain, where it was revered by his partisans as that of a martyr; and his name was used by them in oaths.^h Many members of the sect were reunited to the Church after a council held at Toledo in 400,ⁱ but a remnant of it is mentioned as existing by the first council of Braga in 561.^k

See Tillem. viii. 509-510; Ampère, i. 321. The fact that such feelings were shown seems to be a sufficient refutation of Walch's argument (iii. 478-480), that Priscillian and the rest were not executed as heretics, but for other offences, which might have been properly visited with capital punishment, if the proceedings had been more fairly conducted.

^e See p. 271.

^f Ambr. Ep. xxiv. 12.

^g Prosper. Chron. A.D. 392; Conc. Taurin. c. 6, ap. Hard. i. 959; Tillem. viii. 515; Walch, iii. 414-6; Neander, iv. 497. The downward progress of opinion as to religious persecution is to be gradually traced. While Christianity was persecuted, its professors were earnest for religious freedom. So were the orthodox Athanasius and Hilary,

when Arianism was in the ascendant. At the time which we have now reached, the fathers were against punishing heresy with death; but they still differed as to the question of using measures of constraint. In the following century the infliction of death was justified. Schröckh, ix. 318, seqq.; xi. 336-7; xv. 366; Neand. iv. 496; Gieseler, I. ii. 320.

^h Sulp. Sev. ii. 51.

ⁱ Conc. Tolet. I. ap. Hard. i. 989-996; Idat. Chron. A.D. 400 (Patrol. lxxiv.). The documents ascribed to the Council are in part of later date.

^k Conc. Bracar. I. cc. 1-17 (Patrol. lxxxiv. 563); Baron. 405. 43 seqq.; Pagi, vi. 493; Tillem. viii. 516-527; Mosh. i. 410; Walch, iii. 405, 416-430; Schröckh, xi. 338-340; Matter, iii. 107.

CHAPTER VI.

SUPPLEMENTARY.

I. *Propagation of the Gospel.*

WHILE the empire was distracted by the Arian controversy, the Gospel penetrated into some countries beyond the bounds of the Roman power.

(1.) Whatever may have been the effect produced in his native country by the conversion of Queen Candace's treasurer, recorded in the Acts of the Apostles,^a it would appear to have been transitory; and the Ethiopian or Abyssinian Church owes its origin to an expedition made early in the fourth century by Meropius, a philosopher of Tyre, for the purpose of scientific inquiry. On his voyage homewards, he and his companions were attacked at a place where they had landed in search of water, and all were massacred except two youths, Ædesius and Frumentius, the relatives and pupils of Meropius. These were carried to the king of the country, who advanced Ædesius to be his cupbearer, and Frumentius to be his secretary and treasurer. On the death of the king, who left a boy as his heir, the two strangers, at the request of the widowed queen, acted as regents of the kingdom until the prince came of age. Ædesius then returned to Tyre, where he became a presbyter. Frumentius, who, with the help of such Christian traders as visited the country, had already introduced the Christian doctrine and worship into Abyssinia, repaired to Alexandria, related his story to Athanasius, and requested that a bishop might be sent to follow up the work; whereupon Athanasius, considering that no one could be so fit for the office as Frumentius himself, consecrated him to the bishoprick of Axum. The Church thus founded continues to this day subject to the see of Alexandria. Its metropolitan is always an Egyptian monk, chosen and consecrated by the Coptic patriarch.^b

^a Acts viii. See Euseb. ii. 1.

^b Rufin. i. 9; Soc. i. 19; Soz. vi. 24; Gibbon, iv. 392; Curzon's *Monasteries of the Levant*, Lond. 1849, p. 71. Tille-

mont supposes the expedition of Meropius to have been about A.D. 300, and the consecration of Frumentius about 330 (vii. 209). Others make the inter-

After the expulsion of Athanasius from his see in 356, Constantius wrote to the princes of Axum, desiring that they would not shelter the fugitive,^c and also that Frumentius might be sent to Alexandria, to receive instruction in the faith from the Arian, George. Athanasius, however, was safe among the monks of Egypt, and it does not appear that the request as to Frumentius met with any attention.^d

An Arian missionary, named Theophilus, is celebrated by Philostorgius,^e while his labours are not unnaturally overlooked by the orthodox writers. He was a native of the island of Diu,^f and, having been sent as a hostage to the imperial court, was consecrated as a bishop by Eusebius of Nicomedia.^g Theophilus preached in Southern Arabia, and apparently also in Abyssinia and India, as well as in his native island.^h In India he is said to have found the remains of an older Christianity, which Philostorgius describes as *hetero-ousian*,ⁱ—an assertion which doubtless had no other foundation than the fact that the Indians were unacquainted with the Nicene terminology.^k

(2.) The conversion of the Iberians, or Georgians, is referred to the reign of Constantine. Some of these barbarians, on an incursion into the empire, had carried off among their captives a pious female Christian, whose religious exercises and mortifications were observed with surprise and awe. After a time, a child—one of the king's children, according to Socrates—fell sick, and agreeably to the custom of the country, was carried from one woman to another, in the hope that some one of them might be able to cure him. The captive, on being at length consulted, disclaimed all knowledge of physic, but, laying the child on a couch, said, "Christ, who healed many, will heal this child also;" when, at her prayer, the boy recovered. The queen was soon after cured in like manner; and the captive refused all recompense. Next day the king, while hunting among the mountains, found himself enveloped in a thick mist or darkness. After having called on his gods in vain, he bethought himself of applying to

val less, and place the consecration after 340. See Pagi in Baron. A.D. 327; Vales. in Soc. loc. cit.; Wiltsh, i. 188.

^c Sup. pp. 226, 245.

^d Athan. Apol. ad Const. 28, 31; Schröckh, vi. 28; Neand. iii. 168–170.

^e ii. 6; iii. 4–6; iv. 7.

^f Neander in one place (i. 113) identifies this with Socotra, but elsewhere (iii. 165) with Diu, near the Gulf of Cambay, in Hindostan. The inhabit-

ants of Socotra (Dioscoridis) were descended from a colony planted by the Ptolemies, and their language was Greek. Cosmas Indicopl. l. iii. (ap. Montfaucon, Collectio Nova Patrum, ii. 179).

^g Philost. iii. 4.

^h lb. ii. 6.

ⁱ i.e., holding that the Persons of the Godhead differ in essence.

^k Tillem. vii. 289; Schröckh, vi. 25–6; Neand. iii. 165–6; Giesel. I. ii. 339.

the stranger's God, and the darkness immediately cleared away. Other miracles are added to the story. The king and queen gave their people the example of conversion, and the Iberians, on application to Constantine, were supplied with a bishop and clergy.¹

(3.) The Christian communities of Persia have been mentioned as existing in the earlier period.^m The faith continued to make progress in that country; and Constantine, soon after declaring his own conversion, wrote in favour of the Christians to Sapor, who was king of Persia from 309 to 381.ⁿ But the progress of a rival religion was watched with jealousy and alarm by the Magi; and, on the breaking out of a war between Sapor A.D. 343. and Constantius, they represented to the king that the converts were attached to the Roman interest. A persecution was begun by Sapor's subjecting the Christians to special and oppressive taxes. Their chief, Symeon, bishop of Seleucia and Ctesiphon, was then seized, carried into the royal presence, and required to conform to the national religion. He refused, and was sentenced to imprisonment. As he was led away, Uthazanes, an old eunuch, who had lately been persuaded to renounce Christianity, saluted him reverentially; but the bishop turned away his face. Uthazanes, deeply affected by the reproach, broke out into lamentation—"If my old and intimate friend thus disowns me, what may I expect from my God whom I have denied?" For these words he was summoned before the king, and, after having withstood both threats and entreaties, was condemned to death. Uthazanes had brought up Sapor; he now begged a favour for the sake of his old kindness—that it might be proclaimed that he was not guilty of treason, but was executed solely for being a Christian. The king willingly assented, in the hope that the declaration would deter his subjects from Christianity; but an opposite effect followed. Symeon and many others were put to death. In the following year the persecution was more severe; and there are notices of other martyrs in Persia at later periods in Sapor's reign.^o

(4.) We have already seen that the Gospel was introduced

¹ Soc. i. 20; Soz. ii. 7; Neander, iii. 362.

^m P. 153.

ⁿ Euseb. Vit. Const. iv. 8-13; Soz. ii. 15. Sozomen and others wrongly say that the letter was intended to plead for a cessation of the persecution, which they accordingly place in the reign of Constantine—about 325. See Pagi in

Baron. A.D. 327; Schröckh, vi. 41; Neand. iii. 147; Giesel. I. ii. 336.

^o Soz. ii. 9; Tillem. vii. 78, 241; Neand. iii. 155. See Neumann, Gesch. d. Englischen Reichs in Asien, i. 20 (Leipz. 1857), who quotes the work of Elias, an Armenian bishop of the 5th century, printed at Venice in 1828.

among the Goths by captives who were carried off during the reigns of Valerian and Gallienus.^p Theophilus, bishop of the Goths, was among the members of the Nicene council,^q and seems to have been the immediate predecessor of Ulfilas, who, notwithstanding his Teutonic name,^r is said to have been descended from Cappadocian captives.^s Ulfilas was born in 318, and was consecrated as a bishop while employed on a legation to the emperor Constantius, in 348.^t In 355 the persecution of Athanaric, judge or prince of the Ostrogoths, who regarded the profession of Christianity as a token of inclination to the Roman interest,^u compelled the bishop to lead a large body of Goths across the Danube, and seek a refuge within the empire; and it would seem that this exodus, as well as his labours and influence among his people, contributed to suggest the title which was bestowed on him by Constantius,—“the Moses of the Goths.”^v About fifteen years later the persecution was renewed, and many of Athanaric’s subjects, who had embraced Christianity, were put to death.^x In 376 Ulfilas was employed by Fritigern, prince of the Visigoths, the division to which he himself belonged, and among which his labours had been chiefly exercised, to negotiate with Valens for permission to settle within the imperial territories;^y and in the revolt of the nation against their new protectors, he was sent on an unsuccessful mission to the emperor immediately before the battle of Adrianople.^z The death of Ulfilas took place in 388, at

^p P. 153.

^q Hard. i. 320.

^r *Vulfila* or *Wulfila*, a diminutive of *Vulfs*, a wolf (Patrol. xviii. 467; Massmann’s *Ulfilas*, Stuttgart, 1857, p. ix.). The edition of *Ulfilas* in the *Patrologia* is taken from that by Von der Gabelentz and Löbe, Leipz. 1847. Massmann’s Introduction contains much curious matter as to the history of Christianity among the Goths.

^s Philostorg. ii. 5. For the connexion between the Goths and the Cappadocians, see Massmann, xii.

^t Philostorg. ii. 5 (who, however, wrongly places this under Constantine); Neand. vi. 395; Patrol. xviii. 461.

^u Rückert, i. 40–2.

^v Neander, vi. 395 (quoting a document first published by Prof. Waitz, of Kiel, in 1840); Philost. ii. 5; Massmann, xiv.

^x Soc. iv. 33; Soz. vi. 37. Socrates says that these victims—having received Arianism in simplicity, and not with a heretical mind, are to be reckoned as martyrs. But Baronius (370. 106–7), Tillemont (vi. 606), Revillout (41), and

Rückert (i. 216), seem to be right in arguing that the persecution took place before the Goths professed Arianism as a nation. Among those who suffered were many Audians—followers of Udo, or Audius, a Syrian, who having been excommunicated on account of the freedom with which he censured the clergy, formed a sect of his own, and was consecrated by a bishop who had separated from the church. He was banished to Scythia, where he converted many of the Goths, and founded monasteries. The Audians lived ascetically, observed Easter according to the Quartodeciman rule, and are said to have been Anthropomorphites. See Epiph. lxx.; Theodoret, Hær. Fab. iv. 10; Tillem. vi. 692–5; Mosh. i. 412; Walch, iii. 302–320; Schröckh, vi. 213–6; Neand. iv. 483–5; Gieseler, I. ii. 244; Massm. xv.

^y See Soc. iv. 34; Amm. Marc. xxxi. 3–5; Soz. vi. 37; Jornandes, 25 (Patrol. lxi.). Gibbon, ii. 470, seqq.

^z Massm. xvii.

Constantinople, where he was endeavouring to mediate with Theodosius in behalf of his Arian subjects.^a

Ulfilas employed civilization as the handmaid of religion. To him his countrymen were indebted for the invention of an alphabet,^b and for a translation of the Scriptures,—from which, it is said, the books of Samuel and Kings were excluded, lest their warlike contents should be found too congenial to the ferocity of the Barbarians.^c The Goths received their bishop's words as law; and through his influence they were unhappily drawn away from the orthodox faith, which they had at first professed. The date and the circumstances of this change are subjects of much dispute.^d Ulfilas, indeed, appears to have been more distinguished for practical efficiency than for theological knowledge, and to have imperfectly apprehended the importance of the question between Arianism and Nicene orthodoxy.^e He is known to have been associated with Acacius and Eudoxius at Constantinople in 360, and to have signed the creed of Rimini;^f but it would seem that he nevertheless kept up his connexion with the catholics after that time, and that the distinct profession of Arianism among the Goths did not take place until the reign of Valens, when it became a condition of their admission into his dominions.^g When that heresy had been ejected from the Church—when it had ceased to be debated in councils and to exercise the learning and the acumen of cultivated theologians,—it gained a new importance as being the creed of the Barbarian multitudes who overran the empire.^h

(5.) The existence of lately-founded churches among the Saracens, on the borders of Arabia, is mentioned by Eusebius.ⁱ The roving bands of this wild people were greatly impressed by

^a Massm. xiii. xix.

^b Philost. ii. 5. It has been supposed that the Goths must have had an alphabet while in the East, and that they lost it in the course of their migrations, so that they retained only the knowledge of the Runic characters. These were merely symbolical, and were, moreover, so connected with idolatry, that on that account alone Ulfilas would have found a new character necessary. The Gothic letters were chiefly taken from those of the Greek and Latin alphabets. Milman, iii. 136; and n. on Gibbon, iii. 359; Revillout, 29; Gabelentz and Löbe, Patrol. xviii. 897, seqq.; Massm. li. lii.

^c Philost. ii. 5. See Patrol. 463-4. There was afterwards a complete Gothic Bible; but although the whole was commonly ascribed to Ulfilas (as by Isid.

Hispal. Chron. 103, in Patrol. lxxxiii.), it is uncertain how much of it was really executed by him. See Massm. xlv. vii.

^d See Soc. iv. 33; Soz. vi. 37; Theod. iv. 37; Tillem. vi. 605-8, 798-9; Schröckh, vi. 33; Ozanam, Civil. Chrét. chez les Francs, 25, 33.

^e Rückert, i. 220. For this he meets with loud applause from Baron Bunsen (Zeichen der Zeit, i. 86-7) and Dr. Massmann.

^f Soc. ii. 41; Soz. vi. 37; Tillem. vi. 605.

^g Tillem. vi. 789; Revillout, 42-3 (who, however, is unacquainted with Waitz's document). See Rückert, i. 216; Am. Thierry, Hist. d'Attila, i. 31.

^h Revillout, 2.

ⁱ Comment. in Hesaiam, ap. Montfaucon, Coll. Nova Patrum, ii. 521, Paris, 1706.

the life of the monks who had retired to the deserts, and they visited them with reverence. In the reign of Valens, A.D. 372. Mavia, a Saracen queen, who had been at war with the Romans, stipulated as a condition of peace that Moses, a solitary of renowned sanctity, should be given to her nation as bishop. Moses reluctantly consented to undertake the office, but absolutely refused to receive consecration from Lucius, the Arian bishop of Alexandria, and was eventually consecrated by some of the orthodox bishops who were in exile.^k

II. *Relations of Church and State.*

(1.) For nearly three hundred years the Church had been providentially left to develop itself as a society unconnected with the powers of this world, and by the time when its faith was adopted by the emperors of Rome, it had attained the condition of an independent body, with a regular and settled organisation. But, although it had thus far appeared as self-existent, it was not incapable of a connexion with the state, in which the religious element should hallow the secular, while the secular power in turn should lend its influence for the advancement of religion.¹ There was, however, danger lest one or both of the parties should forget that the church is not a function of the state, but is itself a divinely-instituted spiritual kingdom; and, while it was thus possible that ecclesiastics might rely too much on the secular power, there was also the opposite danger that they might assume towards it an authority professedly derived from heaven, but really unwarranted by any Christian principle.

When Constantine became a convert to the Gospel, the change found both parties imperfectly prepared for understanding the relations which resulted from it. It was likely that the emperor, who was by office Pontifex Maximus—the highest minister of heathen religion, and knowing no authority in that system more sacred than his own,^m—would be unwilling to accept, or even unable to conceive, the different position which was assigned to him in his new communion. It was likely that the clergy, unused as they had hitherto been to intercourse with persons of such exalted rank, would be dazzled on finding themselves invited to associate with the sovereign of the Roman world, and would be disposed to allow him an undue control in spiritual affairs. Yet

^k Rufin. ii. 6; Soc. iv. 36.

¹ Möhler's Athanasius, i. 121-2.

^m Gibbon, ii. 168-9.

on the other hand, as Constantine became their pupil in religion, the power nominally exercised by the emperor was virtually wielded by those ecclesiastics who for the time held possession of his mind.ⁿ The party which had the ascendancy during the last years of his reign, and throughout that of Constantius, lent itself to the assumptions of the emperors; yet this servility was not without an eventual good result, inasmuch as the imperial interference, however objectionable in itself, was thus veiled under the appearance of regular ecclesiastical proceedings. The deprivations, ejections, and intrusions of bishops were sanctioned by subservient synods; so that, in respect of form, the age of Constantine and Constantius has not left the embarrassing precedents which would have resulted if the temporal power had been arrayed on one side and the church on the other, without the intervention of a secular, unscrupulous, and numerous faction of ecclesiastics. And, lamentable as it is that almost in the first years of the connexion between church and state the emperor should be seen on the side of heterodoxy, this also had its advantage. Whereas the patronage and co-operation of the court might have lulled the orthodox into security, and they might thus have silently and unconsciously yielded up their rights, as suspecting no evil from a friend—the disfavour and discountenance which they met with guarded them against such submission; they were forced to declare at the earliest stage that the power of the emperor in spiritual things was not unlimited.^o And it may be matter of instruction and of comfort in later times to know that any difficulties which may be experienced in dealing with those earthly powers to which Christians are bound to yield a willing obedience in all lawful things, were not without a parallel in that very age to which the imagination might be disposed to attribute almost an ideal perfection in respect of the relations between the Church and the State.

ⁿ Schröckh, v. 109-110.

^o Thus Hosius writes to Constantius—"Intrude not yourself into ecclesiastical matters, neither give commands unto us concerning them; but learn them from us. God hath put into your hands the kingdom; to us He hath intrusted the affairs of His church; and as he who should steal the empire from you would resist the ordinance of God, so likewise fear on your part, lest, by taking upon yourself the government of the Church, you become guilty of a great offence. It is written, 'Render unto Cæsar the things

that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's.' Neither, therefore, is it permitted to us to exercise an earthly rule, nor have you, sire, any authority to burn incense." (Athan. Hist. Arian. 44, Oxf. transl.) So Eleusius of Cyzicus and Silvanus of Tarsus told Constantius that "it was for him to determine of punishment, but for them, as bishops, to judge of piety and impiety." (Theod. ii. 27.) In like manner St. Ambrose spoke, when required to give up the basilica to the Arians. (Ep. xx. 19.) Comp. Gieseher, I. ii. 179-180.

Eusebius speaks of Constantine as a “kind of general bishop,”^p and elsewhere relates, that the emperor once told some of his episcopal guests that, as they were bishops within the Church, so he himself was bishop without it.^q The precise meaning of these words has been disputed with a zeal which seems to attribute far too great importance to a saying sportively uttered at table; but it is at least certain that Constantine acted as if he believed himself entitled to watch over the Church, to determine which of conflicting opinions was orthodox, and to enforce theological decisions by the strength of the secular power. His own appearance in the council of Nicæa while he was yet unbaptised,^r the presidency of Constantius, while only a catechumen, at the council of Antioch,^s and his deputation of lay officers to control the synods of Rimini and Seleucia,^t are instances of the manner in which the imperial superintendence was exerted. And yet (as has been before observed) in all these cases, whatever there may have been of lay control, the formal decision of matters was left to the voice of the bishops. The pains which were taken to draw influential prelates—such as Athanasius, Hosius, and Liberius—into a compliance with the measures of the court, are also a remarkable testimony to the importance of the episcopal judgments.

The introduction of general councils contributed greatly to increase the imperial influence. They were necessarily summoned

^p ὅτι τις κοινὸς ἐπίσκοπος. V. C. i. 44.

^q Ὅτι μὲν τῶν εἰσὶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἐγὼ δὲ τῶν ἐκτὸς ὑπὸ θεοῦ καθισταμένοις ἐπίσκοπος ἂν εἴην. (Ib. iv. 24.) A common interpretation is—that he regarded himself as *bishop of things external to the Church*—as charged with the care of its outward relations, entitled to control these, and lending to the Church the support of the civil power. (Mosh. i. 314-5; Heinichen, Excurs. iv. in Euseb. V. C.) Romanists in general understand by τῶν ἐκτ. τ. ἐκκλ. not *things* but *persons* without the Church, viz., heathens and heretics; an interpretation open to the obvious objection that the emperor's power over heathens and heretics was different in kind from that of bishops over their people. Neander (iii. 188) explains Constantine's speech as meaning “that God had made him overseer of that which was without the Church, *i.e.*, the political relations, for the purpose of ordering these according to the will of God; of giving the whole such a direction as that his subjects might be led to pious living.” Gieseler (I. ii. 183) says that there is no authority for speaking

of a bishop of *things*; consequently, τῶν must mean *persons*—the same with τοὺς ἀρχομένους immediately after; and he gives an explanation which appears to err by too great refinement—“You are overseers of those who belong to the Church, and in so far as they belong to it; I am overseer of those who are without the Church, and in so far as they are without it—whether wholly (as the heathens) or partially (as Christians in their civil relations.)” But whatever the strict interpretation may be, the first-mentioned is that which accords with Constantine's conduct in ecclesiastical affairs. It is amusing that Rohrbacher—while he so far departs from the older Roman view of the first Christian emperor's character as to consider that he intermeddled wrongfully in the concerns of the Church,—indignantly rejects the idea that he could have described himself as “l'évêque extérieur de l'église.” —“Voilà,” exclaims the Abbé, with his usual insolence, “comme on traduit les textes que l'on n'a pas lus!” vi. 242.

^r P. 205. ^s P. 216. ^t Pp. 230-2.

by the emperor, since no spiritual authority possessed the universal jurisdiction which was requisite for the purpose; their decisions were confirmed by him, promulgated with his sanction, and enforced by civil penalties of his appointment.^u

(2.) The emperor was regarded as the highest judge in all causes. The bishops of Rome considered it a distinction to be allowed to plead for themselves before his council, after the example of St. Paul.^x But it soon began to be felt that both bishops and presbyters were disposed to carry to the imperial tribunal matters in which the judgment of their brethren had been, or was likely to be, pronounced against them. In order to check this, the Council of Antioch, in 341, and that of Sardica, in 347, passed canons, by which it was forbidden to haunt the court under pretext of suits, or to appeal to the emperor except with consent of the metropolitan and other bishops of the province to which the appellant belonged.^y

In the earlier times, it had been usual for Christians, in order to avoid the scandal of exposing their differences before heathen tribunals, to submit them to the arbitration of the bishops.^z The influence which the bishops had thus acquired was greatly increased by a law which is usually (although perhaps erroneously) referred to Constantine. It was ordered that, if both parties in a case consented to submit it to the episcopal decision, the sentence should be without appeal; and the secular authorities were charged to carry it out.^a Many later enactments relate to this subject. In some canons, persons who should decline the bishop's jurisdiction are censured as showing a want of charity towards the brethren.^b By this power of arbitration, the bishops were drawn into much secular business, and incurred the risk of enmity and

^u Barrow, 185, seqq.; Gibbon, iii. 181-2; Schröckh, v. 111; Planck, ii. 264; Neand. iii. 188.

^x Conc. Rom. A.D. 378, ad Gratian. ap. Hard. i. 841; Gieseler, I. ii. 181.

^y Can. Antioch. 11-12; Can. Sardic. 7-9 (in the Greek).

^z 1 Cor. vi. i.

^a Soz. i. 9; Bingham, II. vii. 3; Gibbon, ii. 178; Schröckh, v. 92; viii. 40; Planck, i. 310-5. The earliest extant law of such purport is of 408 (Cod. Just. I. iv. 8); but, as the Jewish patriarchs had the privilege in question in 398 (Cod. Theod. II. i. 10), it is probable that the bishops possessed it before that date. (Gieseler, I. ii. 165-6.) An alleged law of 318, by which it was

allowed that *one* party in a suit might, even against the will of the other party, carry it before the bishop at any stage of the proceedings, while the bishop's sentence was to be final and was to be executed by the secular power,—is generally given up as spurious. See Cod. Theod. t. vi. 303; Tillem. Emp. iv. 663-4; Bingham, II. vii. 3; Schröckh, v. 92-3; viii. 39; Gieseler, II. i. 79. Yet Prof. Walter (Kirchenr. 382) maintains it, referring to a work by Hænel, 'De Constitutionibus quas Sirmondus edidit,' Bonn, 1840.

^b Conc. Carthag. III. c. 9. (Hard. i. 962); Schröckh, viii. 67-8; Gieseler, I. ii. 165-6.

obloquy. To some of them the judicial employment may possibly have been more agreeable than the more spiritual parts of their function; but many, like St. Augustine, felt it as a grievous burden and distraction,^c and some relieved themselves of the labour by appointing clerical or lay delegates to act for them.^d

Constantius in 355 enacted that bishops should be tried only by their own order—*i. e.* in synods.^e But this privilege was limited by the law of Gratian, in 376, that matters which concerned religion and ecclesiastical discipline should belong to bishops and ecclesiastical synods, but that criminal jurisdiction should be reserved to the secular courts;^f and such was the general principle of the age. As, however, crimes are also sins, and the boundaries which separate ecclesiastical from secular questions are not always easy to determine, there arose frequent cases of difficulty between secular punishment and ecclesiastical penance; indeed the legislation of the early part of the fifth century on this subject is inconsistent with itself—evidencing at once the weakness of the emperors and the watchfulness of the ecclesiastical authorities.^g In cases of crime the clerical office was not as yet supposed to carry with it any exemption from the secular jurisdiction.^h

(3.) The influence of the Gospel, which had perhaps begun in some degree to affect the Roman legislation, even while paganism was yet the religion of the state,ⁱ was now more directly and more powerfully exerted in this respect.^k Moral offences, of which former legislation had taken no notice, were denounced; and at the same time a humaner spirit is found to interpose for the protection of the weak, for the restraint of oppression, and for the mitigation of cruel punishments.^l The bishops were often charged by law with the duty of befriending various classes of persons who might stand in need of assistance; thus a law of Honorius, in 409, which orders that judges should on every Sunday examine prisoners

^c Tillem. xiii. 242-5; Baron. 398. 64-5; Schröckh, viii. 44-5; Neand. iii. 198. St. Augustine used to say that he would rather judge between strangers than friends, because he might, perhaps, make a friend of a stranger in whose favour he decided, whereas one of his friends would certainly be alienated by an adverse sentence. Possidius 10.

^d Planck, i. 516.

^e Cod. Theod. XVI. ii. 12.

^f Ib. 23; Bingham, V. ii. 5-12; Schröckh, viii. 37-8, 65; Planck, i. 305.

^g Schröckh, viii. 42, 66. See Planck, i. 319-324.

^h Gibbon, ii. 178; Gieseler, I. ii. 167.

ⁱ Troplong, de l'Influence du Christianisme sur le Droit Civil, pt. i. c. 4 (Paris, 1856).

^k For the influence of Christianity on the Roman law under Justinian, and also on the barbaric codes, see Milman, Lat. Christ. b. iii. c. 5.

^l Schröckh, viii. 53-5; Gieseler, I. ii. 328-331; Broglie, i. 297, seqq. For the improvement effected in the condition of slaves, see Troplong, pt. ii. c. 1.,

as to the treatment which they received, imposes on the bishops the duty of superintending its execution.^m

As magistrates became Christian, the Church exercised a supervision over them which was of considerable effect; and sometimes the clergy pronounced its censures on local governors who had exercised their power tyrannically. Thus Athanasius excommunicated a governor of Libya;ⁿ and Synesius, bishop of Ptolemais, a generation later, excommunicated Andronicus, governor of the Pentapolis.^o

Intercession for offenders became an acknowledged duty and privilege of the clergy,^p who often successfully interfered to save the lives of criminals, in the hope that penance might enable them to make their peace with heaven.^q But this right of intercession was liable to abuse and corruption. Some of the clergy sold their influence for money;^r monks and others, in the latter part of the century, carried their extravagance so far as forcibly to rescue malefactors on the way to execution; and laws were enacted to check such perverse and disorderly exhibitions of humanity.^s

The privilege of Asylum, which had belonged to some temples, became attached to all churches; and although the earliest laws on the subject date only from the last years of the century, they recognise the privilege as having long before existed on the ground of popular opinion.^t In the state of society which then was, the institution had many important uses;^u but corruptions naturally crept in, and against these edicts were issued. Thus Theodosius enacted, in 392, that public debtors who took refuge in churches should be delivered up, or else that their debts should be liquidated by the bishop who sheltered them.^x The younger Theodosius, in 431-2, extended the right of sanctuary to the whole precinct which surrounded churches, and at the same time he guarded it against some misuses.^y Further restrictions were imposed by Justinian.^z

III. *The Hierarchy.*

(1.) Of the changes among the lower clergy during this period

^m Cod. Theod. IX. iii. 7.

ⁿ Basil, Ep. 61.

^o Synes. Ep. 58, p. 201, ed. Petav. Paris, 1612.

^p Bingham, ii. 8; Neand. iii. 201. The vestals had formerly had a like privilege. Gieseler, I. ii. 169.

^q Aug. Ep. 153; Gieseler, I. ii. 170.

^r Gieseler, I. ii. 309.

^s Cod. Theod. IX. xl. 15, 16; xlv. 1; Fleury, xx. 36; Gieseler, I. ii. 171.

^t Cod. Theod. IX. xlv. 1-3 (A.D. 392-8); Bingham, viii. 11; Neand. iii. 204-5; Gieseler, I. ii. 180-1.

^u Milman, iii. 223.

^x Cod. Theod. IX. xlv. 1.

^y Ib. 4-5; Gibbon, ii. 178.

^z Novell. xvii. 7.

(besides the creation of some new offices which were required by the necessities of the Church) must be mentioned the institution of two local fraternities—the *copiatæ* of Constantinople and the *parabolani* of Alexandria.^a The *copiatæ* or *fossarii* (grave-diggers) were employed in burying the dead—especially the Christian poor, whose interment was free of cost; their number was 1100 under Constantine, but was reduced to 950 by a law of the younger Theodosius.^b It appears that similar guilds were established in other populous cities. The *parabolani* (so called from the hazardous nature of their duties^c) were appointed to attend on the sick.^d In the dissensions of the Alexandrian Church they acquired a character for turbulence,^e so that, in 416, the inhabitants of the city preferred a complaint against them to the younger Theodosius. The *parabolani* were therefore laid under some restraints by the emperor, and their number was reduced to 500; but two years later it was raised to 600.^f

Both the *copiatæ* and the *parabolani* were reckoned as belonging to the clergy, and enrolment among them was sought for the sake of the privileges and exemptions which were attached to it. In many cases the membership appears to have been honorary—persons of wealth paying for admission, enjoying the immunities, and taking no share in the duties. Against this corruption a law of Theodosius II. was directed.^g

(2.) The deacons, whose number in some of the greater churches was still limited to seven,^h acquired an increase of importance in proportion to the greater wealth which was entrusted to their administration. The power of baptizing and of preaching was now occasionally conferred on them.ⁱ In some cases they claimed precedence of the presbyters,^k and would have regarded it as a degradation to be ordained to the presbyterate, so that canons were even found necessary to check their assumptions.^l In every considerable church one of the deacons presided over the rest. It is uncertain at what time this office of *archdeacon* was introduced: at Carthage it would seem to have been towards the end

^a Planck, i. 334.

^b Cod. Just. I. ii. 4 (where they are called *decani*); Bingham, III. viii. Cf. the tract 'De Ordinibus Eccl.' in appen. to Jerome, t. xi. 150.

^c *παρεβάλλω*, or *παρεβάλλομαι*, to venture.

^d Bingham, III. ix. 1-3; Schröckh, viii. 30.

^e Bingham, III. ix. 4.

^f Cod. Theod. XVI. ii. 42-3; Baron.

416. 38; Gieseler, I. ii. 173.

^g Cod. Theod. VII. xx. 12; Cod. Just. I. ii. 9.

^h Conc. Neocæsar. A.D. 314, Can. 14; Bingham, II. xx. 19; Planck, i. 143.

ⁱ Augusti, xi. 202-3.

^k See Hieron. Ep. cxlvi. 2.

^l E. g. Conc. Nic. A.D. 325. c. 18; Conc. Carth. IV. A.D. 398, c. 37; Bingham, II. xxi. 3; Augusti, xi. 194-5.

of the third century, as it is not mentioned by St. Cyprian, whereas, about fifty years later, Cæcilian is described as archdeacon to Mensurius.^m The distinction of one deacon above his brethren may perhaps have been originally a matter of personal eminence, and afterwards established as official. The archdeacon was appointed by the bishop; he was his chief assistant in the government of the church, and was generally regarded as likely to succeed to the bishoprick.ⁿ In the end of the fourth century a similar presidency over the presbyters was given in some churches to an *archipresbyter*—to whom the administration of the diocese was entrusted in the absence or incapacity of the bishop.^o

(3.) The position of the *chorepiscopi* was found to excite the jealousy of the superior bishops. Their functions were therefore more strictly limited by canons,^p and in some quarters a movement was made for the suppression of the office. The Council of Laodicea forbids the appointment of bishops in villages and country places;^q it orders that, in their stead, presbyters with the title of *periodeutæ* (circuit-visitors)—answering to the archdeacons or rural deans of our own Church—should be employed, and that the chorepiscopi already ordained should do nothing without the approbation of the city bishops.^r Chorepiscopi, however, are mentioned as sitting in the Council of Chalcedon, although only as ^{A.D. 451.} delegates of other bishops,^s and the title is found much later, both in the East and in the West. Thus, the second Council of Nicæa in 787, speaks of chorepiscopi as ordaining readers by permission of the bishops,^t—a notice which seems to imply that they then belonged to the order of presbyters, and were much the same with the *periodeutæ* contemplated by the Laodicean canon. The Western chorepiscopi of the eighth and ninth centuries will come under our notice hereafter.^u

(4.) The system of distinctions among the bishops was now carried out more fully than in the former period.^x The religious divisions of the Roman world had generally followed the civil divisions, although the rule was not without exceptions;^y and

^m Bingham, II. xxi. 11.

ⁿ Bingham, II. xxi. 2–11; Schröckh, viii. 204–5.

^o Thomassin, II. i. 3.

^p Planck, i. 527–9.

^q *χώρας*.

^r Can. 57, ap. Hard. i. 761; See Thom. I. ii. 1. 10; Bingham, II. xiv. 12; Planck, i. 529; Augusti, xi. 169; Döllinger, i. 211. This council is commonly dated

about A.D. 363; Harduin places it in 372. See Schröckh, vi. 243.

^s Bingham, II. xiv. 12; Schröckh, viii. 201–2; Planck, i. 530; Newman, n. on Fleury, i. 60.

^t C. 14.

^u See Book IV. c. ix. sect. iii. 2.

^x Mosh. i. 312; Schröckh, v. 114–5; viii. 81.

^y P. 159. See Bingham, IX. i. 8.

thus, when Constantine introduced a new partition of the Empire into *dioceses*—each embracing several provinces—a nearly corresponding arrangement naturally followed in the Church.² The bishop of the chief city in each diocese rose to a pre-eminence above the other metropolitans. These bishops usually received in the East the title of *exarch*, and in the West that of *primate*; the most eminent of them were afterwards styled *patriarchs*—a title which had formerly been given to all bishops, and of which the new and restricted sense appears to have been adopted from the Jews.^a

The degree of authority exercised by patriarchs or exarchs was not uniform. It was greatest at Alexandria, where the patriarch had the right of consecrating all the bishops of Egypt and Libya without the intervention of metropolitans. The bishop of Rome had a like power within his narrower jurisdiction, where, as in Egypt, the grade of metropolitans had not yet been introduced;^b but in other countries it was usual that the chief bishop should consecrate the metropolitans, and these the inferior bishops.^c

With the introduction of the larger ecclesiastical divisions came that of synods collected from their whole extent. The patriarchs or exarchs presided; and these councils became the highest ordinary authorities in the affairs of the Church.^d

(5.) The Council of Nicæa recognises three principal sees—Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch—as presiding over the churches in their respective quarters.^e Each of these three was at once the church of a great capital, and was reckoned to have the honour of apostolical foundation.^f From the time when Constan-

^a Zosim. ii. 3; Nat. Alex. VII. c. v. 1-4; Thomassin, I. i. 3. 10; Barrow, 162-3; Wiltsch, i. 57. See Planck, i. 601-3. The title of *diocese* was then used only to designate the great divisions, the sphere of a bishop being styled *parochia*. The division of the Empire was as follows:—

I. PREFECTURE OF THE EAST, including the Dioceses of (1) *The East* (Capital, Antioch); (2) *Egypt* (Alexandria); (3) *Asia* (Ephesus); (4) *Pontus* (Cæsarea in Cappadocia); (5) *Thrace* (Heraclæa, and afterwards Constantinople).

II. PREFECTURE OF EASTERN ILLYRIA—separated from the West in 379; (Capital, Thessalonica). (1) *Macedonia*; (2) *Dacia*.

III. PREFECTURE OF ITALY. (1) *Rome* (Rome); (2) *Italy* (Milan); (3) *Western Illyria* (Sirmium); (4) *Africa* (Carthage).

IV. PREFECTURE OF THE GAULS. (1) *Gaul* (Treves); (2) *Spain*; (3) *Britain*. Gieseler, I. ii. 186.

^a Thomassin, I. xi. 17; Bingham, II. ii. 9; Planck, i. 608-9; Augusti, xi. 147. The title of patriarch, in its special sense, was first expressly given at the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. (Bingham, II. xvii. 8; Schröckh, xvii. 23.) It was assumed by the chiefs of the Montanists (sup. p. 75) and of the Arian Vandal clergy in Africa. Thomassin, I. i. 21. 4.

^b Wiltsch, i. 62. See De Marca, i. 7.

^c Bingham, II. xvi. 23; xvii. 11-12; Gieseler, I. ii. 187; Wiltsch, i. 190.

^d Conc. Cpol. I. A.D. 381, c. 6 (see p. 265); Bingham, II. xvii. 13; Planck, i. 612; Gieseler, I. ii. 187.

^e Can. 6.

^f Neander, iii. 230-2. Alexandria was counted apostolical, as having been

tine raised Byzantium to its new dignity, the bishoprick of that city, which had previously been subject to the metropolitan of Heraclea, the civil capital of Thrace, necessarily became an important position; insomuch that, even before any formal grant of ecclesiastical privileges or precedence had as yet been conferred on it, Eudoxius was supposed to be promoted by a translation to Constantinople from Antioch.^g The second general council enacted that the bishop of Constantinople should stand next to the bishop of Rome, "forasmuch as it is a new Rome"^h—a reason which clearly shows that, in the opinion of the assembled bishops, the secular greatness of the old capital was the ground on which its ecclesiastical precedence rested.ⁱ The honour thus bestowed on Constantinople was not, however, accompanied by any gift of jurisdiction.^k

(6.) The causes which, during the earlier period, had acquired for Rome a pre-eminence over all other churches were, in the fourth century, reinforced by new and important circumstances. Although within his own city the bishop was restrained by the prevalence of heathenism among the nobility, the removal of the court gave him a position of independence and importance beyond what he could have obtained if the imperial splendour had been displayed on the same scene with his own dignity;^l and the Arian controversies greatly increased his influence in relation to the whole Church.^m In the distractions of the eastern Christians, the alliance of the West was strongly desired by each party. The bishop of Rome, as being the chief pastor in the Western Church, naturally became the organ of communication with his oriental brethren, to whom he appeared as the representative of the whole West, and almost as wielding its entire authority. Even where one of the oriental parties protested against his interference, the Roman bishop gained by the application of the other for his aid, or by its consent to his proceedings.ⁿ Except during the temporary lapse of Liberius, the Roman influence was steadily on the side of orthodoxy; thus Rome stood in honourable contrast with the variations of the eastern bishops; its constancy acquired for it

founded by St. Mark, under the direction of St. Peter.

^g Tillem. xv. 700-1; Schröckh, viii. 93; Planck, i. 605; Wiltsch, i. 168; Gieseler, I. ii. 187.

^h Conc. Cpol. I. A.D. 381, c. 3.

ⁱ Baronius tries to throw doubt on the genuineness of the canon—without any better warrant than his dislike of

its substance. See Tillem. ix. 490; and for ingenious evasions, Walter, p. 39.

^k Wiltsch, i. 139.

^l Schröckh, v. 115.

^m Barrow, 175; Wetstein, in Gibbon, ii. 222; Gieseler, I. ii. 205-7; Neander, iii. 191; vi. 406; Milman, iii. 40-2.

ⁿ Planck, i. 634-8.

strength as well as credit, and the triumph of the cause which it had espoused contributed to the elevation of the see. Moreover, the old civil analogy introduced a practice of referring for advice to Rome from all parts of the West. The earliest extant answer to such an application is the synodical letter of Siricius to Himerius, bishop of Tarragona, A.D. 385.^o But by degrees these "decretal epistles" rose more and more from a tone of advice to one of direction and command; and they were no longer written in the name of a synod, but in that of the pope alone.^p

The records of this time, however, while they show the progress of Rome towards the position which she afterwards attained, are utterly subversive of the pretence that that position belonged to her from the beginning, and by virtue of divine appointment. Thus, when the Council of Nicæa, with a view to the schism of the Egyptian Meletius, ordained that the bishop of Alexandria should, agreeably to ancient custom, have jurisdiction over Egypt, Libya, and the Pentapolis, "forasmuch as this is also customary for the Roman bishop"—and further, that "in Antioch and in other provinces the privileges of churches should be preserved"^q—it is evident that no other right over his suffragans is ascribed to the bishop of Rome than that which is also acknowledged to belong to the bishop of Alexandria; and that the privileges of these and of other sees are alike referred to the common foundation of ancient usage.

Again, when the Council of Sardica enacted that any bishop who should wish to appeal from a synod might, with the consent of his judges, apply to Julius, bishop of Rome, and that, if Julius thought fit, a new trial should be granted^r—it is clear that the power assigned to the Roman bishop is not recognised as one which he before possessed, but was then conferred by the council.^s The bishop of Rome had no power of evoking the cause from before another tribunal; he had no personal voice in the decision; he could only *receive* appeals on the application of the councils from which they were made, and commit the trial of them to judges named by himself, or to the bishops of the appellant's province. Moreover, as the Council of Sardica was composed of Western

^p Hard. i. 647. This refers (c. 1) to one of Liberius, which is lost.

^q Planck, i. 658; Gieseler, I. ii. 200–2; Hussey on the Papal Power, 26.

^r Can. 6. See Schröckh, viii. 87–90.

^s Can. 3. (Hard. i. 637.) Comp. Can. 7.

^t This appears still more evident from

the terms of the canon—"Osius episcopus dixit . . . *Si vobis placet*, sancti Petri apostoli memoriam honoremus, ut scribatur ab his qui causam examinarunt Julio Romano episcopo." See Tillem. viii. 110; Pusey on the Councils, 142.

bishops only, there was no pretext for enforcing this canon on the Eastern Church; and, as the occasion which led to the enactment was temporary, so the mention of Julius by name,^t without any allusion to his successors, indicates that the power conferred was temporary and personal, and was granted in consideration of the pledges which the Roman bishop had given for his adherence to the orthodox cause.^u In like manner, when Gratian, in 378, with a view of withdrawing the partisans of Ursicinus from secular tribunals, acceded to the request of a Roman synod that the judgment of them should be committed to Damasus,^x the temporary and special nature of the grant is inconsistent with any such idea as that the jurisdiction of which it speaks had before belonged to the bishops of Rome, or was an ordinary prerogative of their office.^y

The old Latin version of the Nicene canons, and Rufinus in his summary of them, define the jurisdiction of the Roman bishop as extending over the "suburbicarian churches."^z The name of *suburbicarian* was given to the provinces which composed the civil diocese of Rome—the seven provinces of Middle and Lower Italy, with the islands of Corsica, Sardinia, and Sicily.^a To these the patriarchate of Rome was then limited—Milan, Aquileia, and afterwards Ravenna, being independent centres of ecclesiastical government.^b And since both language and historical facts combine to support this view, it is needless seriously to consider such constructions of the canon as that, by the "suburbicarian churches" were meant all those of the Western Empire, or even the churches of the whole world!^c

^t The conjecture "*illi*, (*hoc est tali*)" for *Julio* (Hard. i. 639) appears to be quite unfounded, and is inconsistent with the Greek version.

^u Mosheim, i. 318; Schröckh, vi. 85; viii. 104; Planck, i. 640, 646; Gieseler, I. ii. 196-9; Hussey, 1-12.

^x Hard. i. 840-3.

^y Schröckh, viii. 111-2; xii. 140; Planck, ii. 643-4; Gieseler, I. ii. 198; Hussey, 14.

^z Hard. i. 329, 333; Ruf. Hist. Eccl. i. 6.

^a Laud against Fisher, p. 203, ed. Ang. Cath. Lib.; Bingham, IX. i. 9-11; Schröckh, viii. 103; Gieseler, I. ii. 195; Wiltsh, i. 75.

^b Gieseler, I. ii. 215. As to Ravenna, Tillem. xv. 190; Wiltsh, i. 86-7.

^c See Baron. 325. 124, and the references, &c., in Gieseler, I. ii. 194. Equally bold is the interpretation by

which Bellarmine makes the other words already quoted from the same canon (p. 304) to mean—not that the superiority of Alexandria is to be like that of Rome, but—that it had been the custom of the Roman bishops to govern the Egyptian patriarchate by means of the bishops of Alexandria! De Rom. Pontif. ii. 13. (Opera, i. 641, ed. Colon. 1622.) Döllinger, admitting the limitation of the term *suburbicarian*, offers an ingenious explanation of the passage in Rufinus—That that writer means to speak of the immediate *metropolitan* power of Rome as it was in his own time, when the bishop had transferred to *vicars* the metropolitan authority over all but the suburbicarian provinces—the *papal* power being (as Dr. Döllinger supposes) all the while distinct from the patriarchal or metropolitan power, and not coming into contempla-

The interference of the Roman bishop was still resisted whenever he attempted to invade the privileges of other Churches. The African and the Eastern Churches throughout acted in entire independence of the Roman authority,^d and frequent canons were made against carrying causes out of the provinces to which they belonged. There was no idea of any divine right of superiority to other Churches; for, although it was often said that the bishop of Rome ought to be honoured as the successor of St. Peter, that Apostle himself was not yet regarded as more than the first among equals, nor were his successors supposed to have inherited any higher distinction above their brethren in the episcopate.^e

(7.) From the time of Constantine the members of the Christian ministry attained a new social position, with secular advantages which had until then been unknown. The exemption from *curial* offices, which was granted to them by the first Christian emperor, was, indeed, withdrawn or limited by his successors,^f but they enjoyed a valuable privilege in their freedom from all *sordid* offices,^g and from some of the public imposts, although still liable

tion here. By this distinction he would explain many other things which are usually supposed to tell against the papacy. But in those things themselves no such distinction appears. There is, for example, no ground for saying that the bishops of Ravenna, while resisting the bishop of Rome as patriarch, admitted his authority over them as pope. And the theory comes altogether too late.

^d Gieseler, I. ii. 203-4. See Soz. iii. 8, where some of the Orientals tell Julius, that, as the Eastern Church had not interfered with the Roman in the matter of Novatian, so he ought not to dictate to them. Also the conduct of St. Basil, in Tillem. viii. 403; Barrow, 113; Gieseler, I. ii. 205-6, &c.

^e See the interpretations of St. Matth. xvi. 18-9, by writers of this time, in Gieseler, I. ii. 209-212. A remarkable *negative* evidence against the papal claims may be found in St. Jerome, Ep. cxxv. 15, where submission to one head is enforced on monks by the instinctive habits of beasts, bees, and cranes, the contentions of Esau and Jacob, of Romulus and Remus, the oneness of an emperor in his dominions, of a judge in his province, of a master in his house, of a pilot in a ship, of a general in an army, of the bishop, the archpresbyter, and the archdeacon in a church; but there is no mention of the one universal bishop.

^f See p. 182. Julian recalled the clergy who had been exempt to perform their curial duties (Cod. Theod. XII. i. 50). Theodosius says in 383—"Curiales qui ecclesiis malunt servire quam curiis contemnunt illa quæ subtrahunt," &c. (Ib. 104.) In 386, he compelled the curial clergy to pay for substitutes in the civil offices to which they were liable (ib. 115); he declares those who had been ordained before his second consulship to be exempt as to their patrimony, but requires those whose ordination was later to give up all. (Ib. 121.) Innocent, bishop of Rome, in 404, orders that *curiales* shall not be ordained, because trouble may arise from the emperor's afterwards requiring their services, and in their civil office they would have to exhibit spectacles of diabolical origin. (Ep. ii. c. 11; Patrol. xx.) By a law of Valentinian III., A.D. 439, such persons were at ordination to share their property with their children, if they had any, reserving only one share for themselves; if childless, they were to give up two-thirds to the municipal body of their town. Cod. Theod. Novell. 38 (t. vi. app. p. 16); cf. Cod. Theod. XII. 1. 49, 123, &c.; Cod. Justin. Novell. cxxiii. 15; Bingham, V. iii. 13-6; Planck, i. 291.

^g Constantius, Cod. Theod. XVI. ii. 10, 14-5. For the definition of such offices, see the Cod. Theod. t. iv. 128-9.

to the land-tax, and to most of the ordinary burdens.^b The taxes to be paid by ecclesiastics who were engaged in trade, were regulated by laws of Constantius, Valentinian, and Gratian: the fact that such laws were passed, rather than a prohibition of trading, seems to prove that resources of this kind were yet necessary for the support of some among the clergy.¹ The wealth of the body, however, was vastly increased. Constantine, besides munificent occasional gifts, bestowed on them a stated allowance of corn, which was revoked by Julian. Jovian restored a third part of this, and promised to add the rest when the cessation of a famine, then raging, should enable him to do so; but his reign ended before he could fulfil the promise, and it was disregarded by his successors.^k Tithes were now paid—not, however, by legal compulsion, but as a voluntary offering;^l so that we need not wonder to find complaints of difficulty and irregularity in the payment;^m and a very great addition of riches flowed in on the Church, in consequence of the law of Constantine which allowed it to receive bequests of property.ⁿ

These changes naturally operated for evil as well as for good. For the sake of the secular benefits connected with the ministry, many unfit persons sought ordination;^o while the higher dignities of the Church became objects of ambition for men whose qualifications were not of a spiritual kind. At the election of a bishop, unworthy arts were employed by candidates; accusations which, whether true or false, give no agreeable idea of the prevailing tone of morals, were very commonly brought by each faction against the favourite of its opponents; and disgraceful tumults often took place.^p

^b Gratian, A.D. 382, in Cod. Theod. XI. xvi. 15; Bingham, V. iii. ; Planck, i. 293-6. Constantine at first exempted them from the land-tax, but afterwards re-imposed it (sup. p. 182); his successors varied in the manner of levying it. The synod of Rimini met with an absolute refusal from Constantius when they attempted to obtain an exemption. (Cod. Theod. XVI. ii. 15.) When St. Ambrose says that the church-lands pay tribute, Baronius endeavours to show that the clergy had a divine right of exemption from taxes, and that their payments were simply voluntary! 387. 11, seqq.

¹ Cod. Theod. XVI. ii. 10. 14; Schröckh, vi. 17, viii. 7-10. It was not until A.D. 452, under Valentinian III., that the clergy were forbidden by the

imperial law to trade. (Cod. Theod. Nov. 12. t. vi. Append.) The African council of A.D. 419 (c. 52) ordered that “Clericus victum et vestimentum sibi ab artificio vel agricultura absque officii sui duntaxat detrimento præparet.”

^k Theod. iv. 4; Tillem. Emp. iv. 587.

^l Walter, Lehrb. des Kirchenrechts, 513.

^m Bingham, V. v. 3.

ⁿ P. 183; Planck, i. 279-282.

^o Gieseler, I. ii. 308; Planck, i. 333.

^p Chrysost. de Sacerdot. iii. 15; Gibbon (ii. 176) says that the income of a bishop varied from 2 to 30 lbs. of gold, and that the average was about 600*l*. In order to check the ambition of bishops, many canons were made against translation (e.g. Can. Nic. 15; Antioch. 21; Sardic. 1); but without much ef-

The intercourse of courts was a trial for the bishops: while in many it naturally produced subserviency,^a in others it led to a mistaken exaltation of spiritual dignity in opposition to secular rank. Thus, it is told with admiration that St. Martin of Tours, when at the court of Maximus, allowed the empress to wait on him at table;^r and that, when the emperor had desired him to drink before him, and expected to receive the cup back from the bishop, Martin passed it to his own chaplain, as being higher in honour than any earthly potentate.^s

Luxury and pride increased among the clergy of the great cities. St. Jerome agrees with Ammianus Marcellinus as to the excessive pomp by which the Roman hierarchy was distinguished, the splendour of their dress and equipages, the sumptuousness of their feasts; while the heathen historian bears a testimony which is above suspicion to the contrast presented by the virtue, simplicity, and self-denial of the provincial bishops and clergy in general.^t Prætextatus, an eminent pagan magistrate, who was concerned in suppressing the feuds of Damasus and Ursicinus, sarcastically told Damasus that he himself would forthwith turn Christian, if he might have the bishoprick of Rome.^u The emperors found it necessary to restrain by law the practices of monks and clergy for obtaining gifts and legacies. Thus Valentinian, by a law which was addressed to Damasus, and was read in all the churches of the capital,^x enacted that ecclesiastics and monks should not haunt the houses of widows or female wards; and that they should not accept anything by donation or will from women who were connected with them by spiritual ties.^y Jerome, who draws many lively pictures of the base devices by which some of his brethren insinuated themselves into the favour of wealthy and aged persons, says, with reference to this edict, "I do not complain of the law, but I grieve that we should have deserved it."^z Other

fect. (Bingham, VI. iv. 6; Neander, iii. 217. See above, p. 263, ^u.) The 27th of the canons which pass under the name of the Fourth Council of Carthage (A.D. 398), and which are supposed to be partly the work of that council, and partly a collection of African canons in force about the time when it was held (Tillem. xiii. 982-5; Schröckh, viii. 196)—forbids that bishops be translated from motives of ambition, but allows translation when it may be for the benefit of the Church.

^a Gieseler, I. ii. 175-6, 312.

^r Sulp. Sev. Dialog. ii. 6 (Patrol. xx.)

^s Id. de Vita Martini, c. 20.

^t Amm. Marc. xxvii. 3; Hieron. Ep. liii. &c.

^u Hieron. adv. Joh. Hierosol. 8 (t. ii).

^x Hence Baronius (370. 123) professes to think that it was probably solicited by Damasus!

^y A.D. 370. Cod. Theod. XVI. ii. 20. It is to be observed that the law was directed against individuals, not against the church. Nat. Alex. vii. 150.

^z Ep. lii. 6. So St. Ambrose, in his answer to Symmachus (Ep. xviii. 14), after comparing the state of the clergy

acts followed, annulling all dispositions of property which women, embracing a religious life, might make to the prejudice of their natural heirs, and guarding against the evasions which might be attempted by means of fictitious trusteeships.^a

Such bequests were, however, discouraged and often refused by the more conscientious bishops, such as St. Ambrose and St. Augustine.^b And while we note the facts which show how in this age, as in every other, the Church but too truly realised those parables which represent it as containing a mixture of evil amidst its good, we must not overlook the noble spirit of munificence and self-denial which animated multitudes of its bishops and clergy, or their exertions in such works of piety and charity as the relief of the poor, the redemption of captives, the erection of hospitals, and the adornment of the divine worship.^c

(8.) The changes of the fourth century tended to depress the popular element in the Church.^d By the civil recognition of their religion; by the increase of wealth; by their intercourse with the highest personages in the state; by the frequency of synods collected from large divisions of the Church, and limited to their own order;^e by the importance which accrued to them when questions of theology became matters of state and agitated the whole empire—the bishops were raised to a greater elevation than before above the other orders of the clergy.^f The administration of the Church was more thrown into their hands; and in the election of bishops the influence of the order became greater, chiefly in consequence of the factions of the people. Thus, when a vacant see was disputed by exasperated parties, it often happened that the prelates whose business it was to ratify the election, suggested a third candidate by way of compromise, and that their nomination was accepted.^g In some cases the election was removed

with that of the heathen priesthood — “*Quod sacerdotibus fani legaverit Christiana vidua, valet; quod ministris Dei, non valet. Quod ego non ut querar, sed ut sciant quid non querar, comprehendere; malo enim nos pecunia minores esse quam gratia.*” See Gieseler, I. ii. 173, 309.

^a Theodosius, in Cod. Theod. XVI. ii. 27–8, &c.; Schröckh, viii. 11–2.

^b Ambros. in Luc. lib. viii. 77, 79; Aug. Sern. 355; Possidius, 24.

^c Neand. iii. 193–4; Gieseler, I. ii. 313.

^d Schröckh, viii. 42.

^e Planck, i. 377.

^f See Hieron. Ep. lii. 7. Some of the

canons of the Fourth Council of Carthage (A.D. 398) are intended to protect the presbyters both from their superiors and from their inferiors. Thus, a bishop must not suffer a presbyter to stand while he himself is seated (34); in church, and in ecclesiastical assemblies, he is to sit above presbyters, but “*intra domum*” he is to remember that he is their colleague (35); the deacons are to understand that they are servants of the presbyters, as well as of the bishop (27), and are not to sit down without leave of the presbyters (39).

^g Gibbon, ii. 171; Planck, i. 439–442. Sometimes the bishops proposed a candidate at first, but the people insisted

from the city for which a bishop was to be appointed to that of the metropolitan.^h The privilege of choice, which was often injudiciously used by the multitude,ⁱ was gradually limited by canons which fixed the qualifications for the episcopate.^k And, although the right of voting was not yet restricted to persons of superior station,^l the emperor swayed the elections to the greater sees—especially those of the cities in which he resided—and sometimes directly nominated the bishops.^m

The orders of the ministry remained as before, but it was not usual to go regularly through the lower grades. Thus we find that very commonly deacons were raised to the episcopate, or readers to the presbyterate, without passing through even a symbolical ordination to the intermediate offices;ⁿ and we have seen in the instances of Ambrose and Nectarius that even unbaptised persons were chosen for bishops, and, after receiving baptism, were advanced at once to the highest order of the ministry.^o

The practice of forcible ordinations was a remarkable feature of this age. The only expedient by which a person could protect himself against the designs of a bishop or a congregation, who considered him fit for spiritual office, was that of swearing that he would not submit to be ordained; for it was thought that one who had taken an oath of this kind ought not to be compelled to forswear himself.^p When the custom of such ordinations had been introduced, reluctance to undertake the ministerial function was often feigned for the purpose of gaining importance.^q Both forced ordinations and the hasty promotion of neophytes were, after a time, forbidden by canons and by imperial edicts;^r in some of which a curious distinction was made between the case of bishops and that of presbyters or lower clergy, who had been ordained without their own consent. The latter were allowed to renounce their orders; but this liberty was denied to the bishops, on the ground that none were really worthy of the episcopate but such as

on having another. No bishop was in any case to be obtruded on an orthodox flock. Bingham, IV. ii. 4; Neand. iii. 216.

^h Planck, i. 447.

ⁱ Conc. Laod. A.D. 372 (?) c. 13, orders that the choice of persons for the *ἐπισκοπῆς* (apparently the episcopate) is not to be allowed *τοῖς ὀχλοῖς*.

^k Gibbon, ii. 171.

^l This is the opinion of Bingham, IV. ii. 8. See Planck, i. 446-8; and below, c. xiv. sect. 1.

^m Bingham, IV. ii. 16; Gieseler, I. ii. 182; Planck, i. 262-3; Milman, n. on Gibbon, ii. 172.

ⁿ Tillem. ix. 67.

^o Pp. 264, 267. Tillem. ix. 65; Bingham, IV. x. 4-7.

^p Bingham, IV. vii. 1-2; Gibbon, ii. 173. See Basil. Ep. clxxvi. 10; Aug. Ep. 125-6.

^q Gieseler, I. ii. 312.

^r Can. Sardic. 13; Siric. Ep. iii. (Hard. i. 856); Tillem. x. 360; Neand. iii. 214.

were chosen against their will.^s In the fifth century, ordination began to be employed as a means of disqualifying unfortunate politicians for taking any further part in the affairs of the world. Some of the latest emperors of the West were set aside by this expedient.^t

(9.) The influence of the monastic spirit tended to advance the practice of celibacy among the clergy and the opinion of its obligation. At the Council of Nicæa, it was proposed that married bishops, presbyters, and deacons should be compelled to abstain from intercourse with their wives;^u but Paphnutius, an Egyptian bishop, strongly opposed the motion, representing the holiness of Christian marriage, and the inexpediency of imposing on the clergy a yoke which many of them might be unable to bear, and which might therefore become the occasion of sin, and injurious to the Church. It was, he said, enough to adhere to the older law of forbidding marriage after the reception of the higher orders. The argument was strengthened by the character of the speaker. He had a high reputation for sanctity; he was honoured as a confessor, having lost an eye in the last persecution; and his motives were above suspicion, as he himself lived in celibacy and strict asceticism. The council allowed itself to be guided by Paphnutius and rejected the proposal.^x

The Council of Gangra,^y which was held against Eustathius of Sebaste,^z condemns, among other extravagances connected with this subject, the refusal to communicate with married priests.^a And in most eastern churches, although the practice of celibacy, or of abstinence from conjugal intercourse, became usual, it continued to the end of the century to be voluntary.^b

In the West, an important step towards the establishment of celibacy was taken by Siricius, in his decretal epistle of 385,

^s Leo et Anthem. A.D. 469, Cod. Just. I. iii. 31; Conc. Aurel. III. A.D. 538, c. 7; Bingham, IV. vii. 3-4; Schröckh, xvi. 326.

^t Avitus, A.D. 456; Glycerius, A.D. 475. Gibbon, iii. 299, 330.

^u The proposal was probably made by Hosius, as it agrees with a canon of the Council of Eliberis, at which he had been present. See p. 177, n. ^g. Theiner, i. 84; Gieseler, I. ii. 255.

^x Soc. i. 11; Soz. i. 23. Baronius (325. 50) is very angry with these historians for their account of the affair.

^y Some place this as early as 325; Gieseler, between 362 and 370 (I. ii. 245.) See n. on Socr. ii. 43; Labbe, ii.

419; Hard. i. 529; Schröckh, v. 238-242; Neand. iii. 346.

^a This has been questioned, as by Walch, who supposes that the council was before Eustathius became a bishop. iii. 543-6.

^b Can. iv. ap. Hard. i. 533. Gregory Nazianzen speaks of persons who, by way of excuse for deferring their baptism, pretended that they could not receive it at the hands of a married bishop or presbyter. (Orat. xl. 26.) This, as Theiner (i. 242) observes, is a proof how common marriage was among the eastern clergy.

^c Soc. v. 22; Schröckh, viii. 21-2; Theiner, i. 241; Gieseler, I. ii. 260.

addressed to Himerius, bishop of Tarragona. After stating that some clergymen had had children, and had defended themselves by pleading the Mosaic law, he argues that the cases are unlike, inasmuch as among the Jews the priesthood was hereditary, whereas among Christians it is not so; and, further, that, as the Jewish priests separated themselves from their wives during the periods of ministering in the temple, so for the Christian clergy, who are always on duty, the separation must be perpetual. He ordered that presbyters and deacons should abstain from their wives; that such as had before violated this rule through ignorance should be allowed to retain their places, but on condition of observing continence, and without the hope of promotion; that if any one attempted to defend the contrary practice, he should be deposed; that no man who had married a widow, or who had been more than once married,^c should be eligible to the ministry; and that clergy contracting such marriages should be deposed.^d The frequency of enactments in pursuance of this decretal, and the mitigations of its provisions which some of them contain, indicate, in addition to other facts, that great difficulty was found in enforcing it.^e

In proportion as the marriage of the clergy was discouraged, the practice of entertaining female companions or attendants in their houses increased.^f The council of Nicæa enacted that no women should be admitted in this capacity except such as from near relationship or from age might be regarded as beyond suspicion of improper familiarity with the clergy.^g

^c It was a question whether a clerk who had married once before and once after baptism were a digamist. St. Jerome (Ep. lxix. 2) decides in the negative; but his editors observe that the western authorities (such as Innocent and Leo) were generally on the other side.

^d Hard. i. 849-850.

^e Theiner, i. 252, 263; Gieseler, I. ii. 258.

^f Hieron. Ep. xxii. 14; Theiner, i. 282, seqq.

^g Can. 3. From a misunderstanding of the words *subintroductam mulierem* in the translation, it was supposed during the middle ages that this canon was directed against the marriage of the clergy. (See the Defence of the first Roman Council under Gregory VII., in Hard. vi. 1532.) The idea of referring the prohibition of marriage to apostolical authority is an invention of the later

Romanists. (Gieseler, I. ii. 257.) The Oxford annotator on Fleury (i. 182) gives a highly ingenious account of the matter—"Earnestness and persecution seem at first to have superseded the need of canons, and all but readers and singers observed continence. But no sooner had Constantine granted the Christians in Spain liberty of worship, A.D. 306, than we find a Council at Eliberis, A.D. 309, requiring continence of all clerks;" and the other regulations of the century are represented as occasioned by the relaxation which followed on the cessation of persecution. Thus a view which had been put forth by Romanist writers by way of argument, is repeated as a historical statement by one who, when he wrote, was still nominally a member of the English church, without any hint even that there is a question as to the date of the Spanish Council.

IV. *Monasticism.*

The monastic life received a vast impulse during the fourth century. The profession of Christianity was no longer a mark of separation from the mass of men; some further distinction appeared necessary for those who aspired to a higher life. Moreover, with the cessation of persecution the opportunities of displaying heroism in confession and martyrdom had ceased.^h Hence many persons, seeing the corruption which was now too manifest in the nominally Christian society, and not understanding that the true and more courageous course was to work in the midst of the world and against its evil, thought to attain a more elevated spirituality by withdrawing from mankind, and devoting themselves to austerity of life and undisturbed communion with heaven.ⁱ

Paul, who has been mentioned^k as the first Christian hermit, spent his life, from twenty-three to a hundred and thirteen, in the desert without contemporary fame or influence.^l In the year of his retirement, A.D. 251, the more celebrated Antony was born of Christian parents at Coma, a village in the Thebaid.^m In boyhood and youth he showed a thoughtful and religious character. He learnt to read and write his native Coptic, but never acquired even the alphabet of Greek,ⁿ and was unable to speak the language.^o Before reaching the age of twenty he lost his parents, and came into possession of a considerable property. One day he was struck while in church by the Gospel of the rich young man, who was charged to sell all that he had, give to the poor, and follow the Saviour, that he might have treasure in heaven. Antony forthwith made over his land to the inhabitants of his village, turned the rest of his estate into money, and bestowed all on the

^h Gieseler, I. ii. 235.

ⁱ Guizot, ii. 18; Neander, iii. 322; Ritter, v. 80.

^k P. 177.

^l His life was written by St. Jerome (t. ii.). Antony, it is said, was warned, at the age of ninety, that a solitary more perfect than himself had been living ninety years in the desert. He sets out in quest of him; meets on the way a centaur and a satyr, the latter of whom requests his prayers; finds Paul; is cared for by ravens, who for sixty years had fed the elder hermit, and now bring daily a double allowance of provisions. Antony sees Paul's soul borne upwards by angels, "to the choir of prophets and apostles," and, with the

help of two lions, buries his body.—Neander (iii. 324) is inclined to question the whole story of Paul. He is not mentioned in the life of Antony.

^m Vita, 1. The chief authority for the life of Antony is a biography ascribed to St. Athanasius. Its genuineness has been questioned; but it seems to be more generally regarded as interpolated than as spurious. (Schröckh, v. 146; viii. 234-6; Gieseler, I. ii. 408.) Möhler (Athan. ii. 90) considers it to be an idealised picture of the monastic life, founded on historical fact.

ⁿ Soz. i. 13; Tillem. vii. 307; Neander, iii. 324-5.

^o Vita, 72-3.

poor, except a small portion which he reserved for the maintenance of his only sister.^p On another occasion, he was impressed in like manner by the command, "Take no thought for the morrow." He parted with the remainder of his property, committed his sister to a society of religious virgins, and embraced an ascetic life.^q

At first he took up his abode near his own village; for, says his biographer, the great Athanasius, such was then the practice of those who desired a religious life, when as yet there were no monasteries in the desert. He laboured with his own hands, and gave away all that he could spare from his necessities.^r He visited all the most famous ascetics whom he could hear of—endeavouring to

learn from each his distinguishing virtue, and to combine
A.D. 275. all their graces in his own practice. After a time he

shut himself up in a tomb, from which he removed, ten years later,

to a ruined castle near the Red Sea.^s He increased his
A.D. 285. mortifications;^t but temptation followed him from one

retreat to the other. He fancied himself beset by devils in all manner of frightful shapes, and at other times by worldly thoughts or by sensual enticements.^u The noise of his conflicts with the enemy was heard by those who passed by his dwelling; more than once he was found almost dead from the chastisement which had been inflicted on him by his ghostly assailants.^v Antony became famous; many persons made pilgrimages to see him; and, after

having spent twenty years in his castle, without either
A.D. 305. leaving its walls, or admitting any one within them,

he went forth and received disciples, who settled around him, studding the desert with their cells.^x

The persecution under Maximin drew Antony to Alexandria.

He attended on the sufferers and in every way exposed
A.D. 312. himself to death; but when the heat of the danger had

passed over, he concluded that the crown of martyrdom to which he had aspired was not intended for him, and, wishing to escape from the oppressiveness of the admiration which waited on him, he sought out, under the guidance of some Saracens, who were miraculously thrown in his way, a solitude more remote than that in which he had before lived.^y His abode was now a cave in the side of a lofty mountain, with a supply of cool water and the shade

^p Vita, 2.

^q Ib. 3.

^r Ib. 4.

the visitor be holy, he will tell; if not, your firmness will perplex and weaken him. c. 43.

^s Ib. 8, 12.

^t Ib. 7.

^u Ib. 5-9, 39, 41. His account of the devil's illusions (22-43) is remarkable. His rule for dealing with visions was—Ask, "Who art thou and whence?" If

^v Ib. 8, 13, 52.

^x Ib. 13-15, 44.

^y Ib. 46-8.

of a few palm-trees beside it; he cultivated a small patch of corn and vegetables, that he might be able not only to spare others the labour of supplying him with bread, but to furnish something for the refreshment of visitors. The beasts of the desert, in resorting to the water, damaged his crops; but he gently laid hold of one, and said to them, "Why do you injure me, when I do you no hurt? Depart, and, in the name of the Lord, come hither no more!" and his charge was obeyed.^z The more he withdrew from the world, the more eagerly was he followed. Multitudes flocked to him; imitators arose in great numbers.^a He reconciled enemies, comforted mourners, and advised in spiritual concerns. His interposition was often requested in behalf of the oppressed, and was never exerted in vain.^b When any such business had drawn him to leave his cell, he returned as soon as possible; "a monk out of his solitude," he said, "is like a fish out of water."^c Constantine and his sons sought his correspondence, and invited him to their courts; but, instead of being elated by the honour, he said to his disciples, "Do not wonder if the emperor writes to us, since he is a man; but rather wonder that God has written his laws for men, and has spoken them to us by his Son."^d In the Arian controversies, Antony and his monks were steady and powerful supporters of orthodoxy. In order to aid the cause he paid a second visit to Alexandria, where his appearance made even a greater impression than before, and many pagans were converted in consequence.^e He wrote to Constantine, urging the recall of Athanasius from his first exile, and received an answer expressed in terms of high respect.^f He was favoured with visions and revelations for the comfort of his brethren in the faith; and in cases of doubt he prayed for direction, and received instructions from above.^g Innumerable miracles were ascribed to him, and he supposed himself to work them, but was free from all pride on account of the gift.^h His ghostly enemies still continued their assaults, and philosophers frequently attacked him, in the hope of turning his illiteracy into ridicule; but the firmness of his faith and his natural shrewdness gave him the victory alike over men and demons.ⁱ Severe as his habits were, he had nothing of the savageness which became too common among his followers; he

^z Vita, 49-50.^a Ib. 62, 84.^b Ib. 87.^c Ib. 85.^d Ib. 81.^e Ib. 68-71. Tillemont (vii. 670; viii. 143, 696) dates this in 355; Neander (iii. 330), in 350; Guericke (i. 384), in 325; others, from 330 to 335. The

index to the Festal Letters places it in 338, immediately after the return of Athanasius from his first exile. xviii.

^f Soz. ii. 31.^g Vita, 66, 82.^h Ib. 14, 38, &c.ⁱ Ib. 51, 72.

well understood the dangers of the solitary life, and was earnest in warning against a reliance on the mere outward form of monachism.^k

Antony lived to the age of a hundred and five, and died a few days before Athanasius sought a refuge among the monks of the desert in 356. Of his two sheepskins he bequeathed one to the bishop of Alexandria, and another to Serapion bishop of Thmuis. A cloak, the gift of Athanasius, which had been worn for many years, was to be restored to the donor, and his garment of haircloth fell to two disciples who had long been his especial attendants. He charged these disciples to bury him in a place unknown to all but themselves, lest his remains should be embalmed and kept above ground—a manner of showing reverence to deceased saints which he had often endeavoured to suppress.^l

The cœnobitic system—that of ascetics living in an association—originated with Pachomius, who was, like Antony, a native of the Thebaid. He was born in 292, was converted to Christianity, and practised rigid austerities under the direction of a solitary named Palæmon, until he was visited by an angel, who told him that, as he had made sufficient progress in the monastic life, he must now become a teacher of others, and gave him a code of rules, written on a brazen tablet, which the disciples of Pachomius professed to preserve.^m Pachomius then founded a society in an island of the Nile called Tabenne, which had been indicated to him by a voice from heaven.ⁿ The community was soon extended, so that before the founder's death it embraced eight monasteries, with 3000 inmates—1400 of them in the mother-establishment—and in the beginning of the following century the number of monks was no less than 50,000.^o

^k See his address to the monks, cc. 16–43, and a shorter discourse, c. 55.

^l Ib. 90–1. Rohrbacher wishes us to believe that Antony's injunction proceeded solely from an objection to the Egyptian practice of embalming (vi. 417); but it is clear that he objected to all interference with the repose of the body in the grave. It is said that in the reign of Justinian the body was discovered by revelation, and that it was eventually removed to Vienne. Tillem. vii. 133–4.

^m Vita Pachom. 6–12, 21–2, in book i. of Rosweyde's 'Vitæ Patrum' (Patrol. lxxiii); Soz. iii. 14.

ⁿ Vita, 12. There is a variety of reading between *Ταβέννη νήσος* (the island of

Tabenne), and *Ταβεννήσος* (*Tabennesus*, which is supposed to be a village), in Soz. iii. 14, p. 112. Valois prefers the latter. It would seem that the original settlement was on the island, and that the name of this was "afterwards transferred to the great monastery of Bau or Pabau" (Gibbon, iii. 344). Tillemont (vii. 174) puts the foundation of the society about 325; so Schröckh (v. 162); but Gieseler's date (I. ii. 230) is about 340.

^o Hieron. Præf. in Regul. Pachom. 7. Palladius, Hist. Lausiaca, 38 (a book on the monastic life addressed to one Lausus, and translated in Rosweyde, l. x.); Tillem. vii. 177; Neander, iii. 335.

The monks lived in cells, each of which contained three.^p They were under engagements of absolute obedience to the commands of a chief, who was called *abbot* (from a Syriac word signifying *father*), or *archimandrite* (from the Greek *μάνδρα*, a *sheepfold*).^q Under him each of the monasteries was governed by a head of its own, and the chief abbot from time to time made a circuit of visitation.^r The whole society assembled at the mother monastery twice every year—at the Easter festival and in the month of August.^s The monks were, by the direction of the brazen tablet, divided into twenty-four classes, named from the Greek letters, and arranged according to the characters of the individuals; thus the simplest were in the class I, while the more knowing were ranked under the letters of more complicated form.^t A strict community of all things was enforced, so that it was considered as a serious breach of discipline to speak of “my” coat, or book, or pen.^u The monks employed themselves in agriculture, basket-weaving, rope-making, and other kinds of industry. The produce of their labour was carried down the Nile in boats belonging to the society and manned by monks; and the money which it fetched in the markets of Alexandria was not only enough for their own support, but enabled them to perform works of charity.^x They prayed many times a-day,^y fasted on the fourth and sixth days of the week, and

^p The observances of the order are gathered partly from the account of the brazen tablet, in the *Life*, c. 22; partly from St. Jerome's translation of the *Rule of Pachomius*. (Hieron. t. ii.)

^q Gibbon, iii. 348; Neander, iii. 349; Gieseler, I. ii. 230. The title of abbot was also often given to other monks, especially to such as were distinguished for age or sanctity. Ducange, s. v. *Abbas*, p. 19.

^r Tillem. vii. 179; Neander, iii. 335.

^s Hieron. *Præf.* 7; Fleury, xx. 9; Tillem. vii. 178.

^t Vita, 22; Soz. iii. 15.

^u Cassian de Cœnob. *Instit.* iv. 13. This was a general feature of monachism. St. Jerome (*Ep.* xxii. 33) tells a story of one of the Nitrian monks, “rather saving than avaricious,” who left at his death a hundred *solidi*, which he had earned by weaving flax. The brotherhood, about 5000 in number, held a consultation as to the disposal of the money. Some were for giving it to the poor; some, to the church; others to the relatives of the deceased. But the fathers of the society, “*Sancto in eis loquente Spiritu*,” quoted the text—“Thy money perish with thee!” and

ordered that it should be buried with its owner. Jerome adds, that this was not done out of harshness towards the deceased monk, but in order to deter others from hoarding. A more remarkable tale of the same kind may be found in Gregory the Great's *Dialogues*, iv. 55. See too the autobiography of Guibert, abbot of Nogent, in the xiith century, i. 22 (*Patrol.* clvi.).

^x Cassian de Cœn. *Inst.* x. 22. Rufinus says that the Egyptian monks used to labour for hire in harvest, and to give their earnings to the poor. *Hist. Monach.* 18.

^y Sozomen's account of the number of times (iii. 14) is not clear, and puzzles Valois (n. in loc.) and Tillemont (vii. 183, 683). In the life of Pachomius it is related that the angel prescribed twelve prayers during the day, twelve in the evening, and twelve in the night; and, on the abbot's expressing surprise at the smallness of the number, told him that the rule was drawn out for the weaker brethren, and that the more perfect would, of their own accord, go beyond it (22). Cassian tells us that the Egyptian monks, instead of observing stated hours of devotion in the day—

communicated on the Sabbath and on the Lord's day.^z Their meals were taken in common—each being preceded by psalmody. They ate in silence, and with their hoods drawn over their faces, so that no one might see his neighbours, or anything but the fare set before him.^a The heavenly rule was not stringent as to the quantity of food—ordaining only that each monk should labour in proportion to his eating; but most of them carried their abstinence beyond the letter of its requirements.^b The sick were tended with remarkable care.^c The monks had a peculiar dress,^d the chief article of which was a goat-skin, in imitation of Elijah, who was regarded as a pattern of the monastic life.^e They were never to undress, except that at communicating they unloosened their girdles. They slept with their clothes on, and in chairs so constructed as to keep them almost in a standing posture.^f

Pachomius had a sister, who, hearing the fame of his institution, was excited to visit Tabenne. On being informed of her arrival, the abbot desired the porter of the monastery to beg that she would be content with the assurance of his welfare; and to inform her that, if she were disposed to imitate his manner of life, he would cause a monastery to be built for her at a distance from him. The message had its effect; the monastery was built by monks from Tabenne; and the sister of Pachomius was soon abbess of a large community of women, regulated by a code which he framed on the model of his own, and subject to his orders, although he never personally visited it.^g After this first example, the formation of such societies was rapid—the female recluses being styled *nonnæ*, *i. e.* mothers.^h Pachomius died in 348.ⁱ

About the same time when Pachomius established his order at Tabenne, the elder Macarius^k took up his abode in the desert of Scetis—a vast solitude near the Libyan frontier of Egypt^l—and Ammon on the Nitrian or Nitre mountain. Around them were soon gathered large numbers of monks, living in separate cells,

time, were continually employed in prayers and psalmody while at their work (De Cœn. Inst. iii. 2). On the different rules of monastic orders in this respect, see Gieseler, I. ii. 231.

^z Hieron. Præf. ad Regul. Pachom. 5; Soz. iii. 14.

^a Vita, 22; Cass. de Cœn. Inst. IV. 18; Soz. iii. 14.

^b Vita, 22.

^c Hieron. Præf. 5; Règul. Pachom. 40-7.

^d The rule of Pachomius—unlike some later rules—is very particular on

the subject of washing the monks' linen. See Nos. 67-72, 148.

^e Hieron. Præf. 64; Soz. iii. 14; Gieseler, I. ii. 238-9.

^f Vita, 22; Palladius Hist. Lausiaca, 38. But the 88th rule speaks of sleeping on mats.

^g Vita, 28.

^h Gieseler, I. ii. 247.

ⁱ Tillem. vii. 197.

^k So called for the sake of distinction from another celebrated monk, his contemporary.

^l Tillem. viii. 577-9, 806; Schröckh, viii. 290.

which were either solitary or grouped together in clusters called *lauræ*.^m The monks met on the first and last days of the week for public worship; if any one were absent, it was concluded that he must be sick, and some of the brethren were sent to visit his cell. Except on such occasions, they never spoke. The Nitrian monks were reckoned to be about 5000 in the end of the century.ⁿ

The monastic system soon spread beyond the borders of Egypt. In Syria it was introduced by Hilarion, a pupil and ^{A.D. 306-}imitator of Antony, who lived fifty years in the desert ^{356.} near Gaza.^o In Mesopotamia it was eagerly welcomed, and derived especial lustre from the genius and piety of the mystic St. Ephrem.^p Eustathius of Sebaste established monasteries in Armenia,^q and, as has been already mentioned, St. Basil organized societies of coenobites in Pontus and Cappadocia.^r Athanasius, on his visit to Rome in 340, was accompanied by some Egyptian monks, who were the first that were seen in the West. Their wild and rude appearance excited the disgust of the Romans, but with many the feeling was soon exchanged for reverence. The profession of religious celibacy found votaries among the younger ladies of the capital; one of these was Marcellina, the sister of St. Ambrose.^s The zeal with which Ambrose, after becoming a bishop, advocated the cause of celibacy, may perhaps have been in part prompted by his sister. He wrote treatises on the subject, maintaining that young women ought to embrace the virgin life in defiance of the will of their parents, and fortifying his argument by tales of judgments which had befallen persons who dared to dissuade their relatives from such a course.^t He extolled virginity in his sermons—even (as he says) to the weariness of his hearers. The matrons of Milan forcibly restrained their daughters from attending these dangerous discourses; but crowds of virgins from other quarters flocked to him for consecration—some of them even from Mauritania.^u The little islands on the coasts of Italy and

^m *Λαύρα* meant a street, and the word was also used to designate the parishes of Alexandria. Epiph. lxix. 1.

ⁿ Soz. iv. 31; Tillem. vii. 154, 159. 160; viii. 577; Neand. iii. 334; Gieseler, I. ii. 230.

^o Soz. iii. 14. There is a life of Hilarion by Jerome (t. ii.) with many miraculous stories. As to his habits, we are told "Capillum semel in anno die Paschæ totondit; super nudam humum stratumque juncum usque ad mortem cubitavit. Saccum quo semel fuerat

indutus nunquam lavans; et superfluum esse dicens munditias in cilicio querere. Nec mutavit alteram tunicam nisi cum prior penitus scissa esset, &c."—c. 10.

^p Schröckh, viii. 255.

^q Soz. iii. 14; Schröckh, v. 166–7.

^r P. 257.

^s Hieron. Ep. lxxvii. 5; Baron. 340. 7; Gibbon, iii. 344; Schröckh, xiv. 161. Möhler, ii. 86.

^t De Virginib. i. 11.

^u Ib. 10.

Dalmatia became sprinkled with monasteries and cells.^x St. Martin, who had lived as a monk in the island of Gallinaria, introduced monasticism into Gaul, built religious houses near Poitiers and Tours, and was followed to the grave by two thousand of the brethren.^y In Africa monasticism made less progress than elsewhere. It did not obtain any footing until it was introduced by St. Augustine, within the last ten years of the century; nor were the authority of that great bishop, and even the example which he gave by living in cœnobite fashion with his clergy, sufficient to attract to the monastic life any but persons of the lower rank. Salvian, about the year 450, witnesses that it continued to be unpopular, and that monks were objects of persecution among the Africans.^z

The rules and habits of the monastic societies differed according to circumstances, and according to the judgment of their founders. Industrial occupations—such as field-labour, building, weaving, or the manufacture of nets, baskets, and sandals—were generally required in the East, and Augustine wrote a treatise against those who wished to be exempt from such labour.^a But St. Martin regarded such things as likely to become hindrances to devotion, and would allow no other manual work than that the younger brethren should transcribe books.^b The monks of Gaul, indeed, having ample employment for their energies in combating the idolatry and superstition of the Barbarians among whom they were placed, did not need to have their hours relieved from vacancy in the same manner as the inhabitants of the Egyptian or Syrian deserts.^c As to food and clothing, also, the varieties of climate were considered. “A large appetite,” says Martin’s biographer, “is gluttony in Greeks; but in Gauls it is nature.”^d

Pachomius required a probation of three years before admission into his order,^e and a similar rule was adopted in other societies. There was as yet no vow exacted at entrance, although St. Basil suggests that a formal profession should be required;^f nor was the

^x Baron. 398. 49–52; Gieseler, I. ii. 251.

“Processu pelagi jam se Capraria tollit;
Squalet lucifugis insula plena viris.
Ipsi se monachos Græco cognomine dicunt
Quod soli nullo vivere teste volunt.
Munera fortunæ metuunt, dum damna ve-
rentur;
Quisquam sponte miser, ne miser esse queat?
&c.”

Rutil. Numatianus de Reditu suo, i. 439, seqq.

^y Sulp. Severus; Soz. iii. 14.

^z Possid. Vita Aug. v., xi.; Salv. de

Gubern. Dei, viii. 4 (Patrol. liii.); Tillem. xiii. 193–9, 226–8; Schröckh, viii. 379–380; xv. 288, 328; Guizot, ii. 64; Gieseler, I. ii. 253.

^a ‘De opere Monachorum.’

^b Sulp. Sev. Vita Martini, 10; Schröckh, viii. 217, 245.

^c Beugnot, i. 304.

^d Sulp. Sev. Dialog. i. 8; Mosh. i. 306; Gieseler, ii. 253.

^e Vita, 22.

^f Ep. excix. 19.

profession of monasticism irrevocable; withdrawal was a subject for penance, but yet it was in some cases even recommended as the safest course.^g

All the chief teachers of the age, both in the East and in the West, vied with each other in the praise of celibacy and monasticism.^h St. Jerome, in particular—the most learned man of his day, who may be regarded as the connecting link between the Eastern and the Latin divisions of the Church—was remarkably active and influential in the cause, and the story of his life belongs in great part to the general history of the subject.

This father—in whom we see extraordinary intellectual gifts and a sincere zeal for the service of Christ strangely combined with extravagance, love of power, pride, vanity, extreme irritability, and bitterness of temperⁱ—was born of Christian parents at Stridon, on the borders of Pannonia and Dalmatia.^k He studied at Rome under Donatus, the commentator on Virgil, and, after having reached manhood, felt himself called to a religious life and was baptised.^l After travelling in Gaul and other countries, he withdrew, in 374, to the desert of Chalcis, eastward of Syria,^m and entered on a course of the most violent mortifications. But the impulses of sensuality, to which he confesses that he had yielded before his baptism,ⁿ revived in the solitude where he had hoped to find freedom from temptation. He strove against them by fasting and prayer;^o and, wishing to add some humiliating occupation to these exercises, he began the study of Hebrew under a converted Jew—the language being recommended for the purpose by the indignity of learning an alphabet, the unmusical sound of the words,

^g Soz. iii. 14; Bingham, VII. iii. 7, 22; Schröckh, viii. 277-8; Gieseler, I. ii. 247.

^h Schröckh, v. 167-8; viii. 233; Theiner, c. xi.; Gieseler, I. ii. 249.

ⁱ Tillemont's *Life of St. Jerome* (vol. xii.) opens with a prefatory chapter on the character of the saint, in which the biographer is curiously distracted between his own impressions and the authority of his church. On the same subject, Dr. Newman, while yet a member of the English Church, wrote as follows:—"I do not scruple to say that, were he not a saint, there are things in his writings and views from which I should shrink; but as the case stands, I shrink rather from putting myself in opposition to something like a judgment of the Catholic world in favour of his saintly perfection. I cannot, indeed, force myself to approve or like against

my judgment or feeling; but I can receive things on faith against both one and the other, and I am willing to take certain characteristics of this learned and highly-gifted man on faith."—(*Church of the Fathers*, 263-4.) I must plainly avow that the morality of such refinements appears to me very questionable, and that I have throughout held myself at liberty to form and to express an opinion as to the personages of ecclesiastical history.

^k The date is placed in 331 by Prosper (*Patrol.* li. 576), who is followed by Schröckh (xi. 7) and by Clinton. Tillemont's date (xii. 6, 618) is 342.

^l Tillem. xi. 7-11.

^m Tillem. xii. 19; Schröckh, xi. 14.

ⁿ Ep. xlviii. 20.

^o Ep. xxii. 7; cxxv. 12; Tillem. xii. 8, 21-3; Theiner, i. 155-7.

and the unadorned plainness of the sacred writings.^p The acquisition proved valuable in a degree more than sufficient to compensate for the injury which he tells us^q that his Latin style, and even his pronunciation, had suffered from it.

Jerome had devoted himself with zeal to classical literature, while he despised the Scriptures for their simplicity. The bent of his studies was changed by a remarkable incident, either while he was residing at Antioch before betaking himself to the desert,^r or during his retirement. He had a severe illness, and was supposed to be dead, when he found himself placed in the presence of the Judge. He was asked his condition, and answered that he was a Christian. "Thou liest," it was said, "thou art not a Christian, but a Ciceronian; for where thy treasure is, there is thy heart also." He was severely beaten, but at his earnest entreaty, and through the intercession of the saints who stood around, his life was spared, in pity of his youth. He swore never again to open a heathen book, and, on returning to the world, found, as he tells us, that his shoulders were black and his body aching from the blows which he had received.^s Jerome seems to have afterwards dealt with this story according to his convenience—treating it as a solemn reality when he wished to dissuade others from the study of secular learning, and as a mere dream when he found himself unable to deny that he had not strictly observed his oath.^t In later ages his vision was often pleaded in favour both of an indolent unwillingness to study and of a fanatical contempt of letters.^u

The controversies of the time disquieted even the desert. Jerome quarrelled with the neighbouring monks as to the disputes of Meletius, Paulinus, and the Apollinarian Vitalis for the possession of the see of Antioch, and as to the use of the term *hypostasis*.^x An appeal to Damasus of Rome for direction seems to have decided him in favour of Paulinus;^y he left the desert in 377, and in the following year was ordained presbyter by that bishop, with a stipulation that he should not be bound to any par-

^p Ep. cxxv. 12.

^q Ep. xxix. 7.

^r Tillem. xii. 24-7, is for the desert; Schröckh, xi. 14-7, for Antioch.

^s Ep. xxii. 30.

^t See Rufin. Apol. ii. 8, and Jerome's answer, i. 30-1; iii. 32. In i. 30, he says that, even if it were not a dream, the inferences against him were wrong. "Dixi me sæculares litteras non deinceps lecturum; de futuro sponsio est,

non præteritæ memoriæ abolitio." M. Ozanam says all that he can for Jerome as to this, i. 302-4.

^u Schröckh, vii. 366; xi. 14-7. See Milton's characteristic comment, "Areopagitica," p. 107, in *Prose Works*, ed. Fletcher.

^x Epp. v., xvii.; Tillem. xii. 43-4; Schröckh, xi. 28-9.

^y Ep. xv.-xvi.; Tillem. xii. 45-9; Schröckh, xi. 30.

ticular sphere of duty.^z After having spent some time at Constantinople, during the episcopate of Gregory, whom he greatly revered,^a he settled in 382 at Rome, where he acted as ecclesiastical secretary^b to Damasus, and assisted him in his studies.

This position, with his talents, his learning, and the reputation of religious experience which he had brought from the East, gave him the means of powerfully forwarding the cause of monasticism and celibacy.^c He soon gained an immense influence among the Roman ladies of rank—the Marcellas, Asellas, Paulas, and Fabiolas. He directed their spiritual life; he read and explained the Scriptures to them, while their eager questions often went beyond his power of answering; he endeavoured to draw all women into a resolution to preserve their virginity or their widowhood, and to engage in a course of asceticism.^d When remarks were made on his confining his instructions to the weaker sex, he answered that, if men would ask him about Scripture, he would not occupy himself with women.^e

The religion which Jerome taught his female pupils was not without its temptations to pride, from which it may be doubted whether his warnings^f were sufficient to preserve them. They were charged to seclude themselves from all other persons; the virgin Eustochium was exhorted to avoid all intercourse with married women as corrupting.^g The pursuits of piety and unusual learning animated them to despise the ordinary amusements of the world; and they were taught to regard such amusements, without any distinction, as sins of the most deadly kind.^h On those who followed his directions Jerome lavished hyperbolic praises. He tells them that a mother who gives up her daughter to celibacy becomes the “mother-in-law of God”ⁱ—an expression which not unnaturally gave occasion for charges of profanity.^k One of his epistles is an elaborate panegyric on Asella, written to Marcella, whom, with an amusing show of gravity, he begs not to

^z Hieron. c. Joh. Hieros. 41; Tillem. xii. 49-51.

^a Adv. Rufin. i. 13; de VV. Illustr. 117; Ullman's Gregory of Nazianzum, 197-9.

^b So it is generally inferred from Ep. cxxiii. 10.—“Cum in chartis ecclesiasticis juvarem Damasum, Romanæ urbis episcopum [et orientis atque occidentis synodicis consultationibus responderem].” Schröckh (viii. 117) follows Buonamici in denying this—interpreting *chartis ecclesiasticis* of scriptural studies—not of ecclesiastical documents. I

have no knowledge of Buonamici's argument; but the words in brackets, which Schröckh does not quote, seem to justify the common interpretation of the others.

^c Tillem. xii. 63; Schröckh, xi. 62; Theiner, i. 161-2.

^d Ep. cxxvii. 7-8; Schröckh, xi. 71; xii. 375.

^e Ep. lxxv. 1. ^f Ep. xxii. 17.

^g Ep. xxii. 16. ^h Schröckh, xi. 76.

ⁱ Ep. xxii. 20.

^k Rufin. Apol. ii. 10.

communicate it to her friend the subject of it.¹ His eulogium on Paula after her death begins thus—"If all the members of my body were turned into tongues, and all my joints were to utter human voices, I should be unable to say anything worthy of the holy and venerable Paula's virtues."^m Eustochium he styles "the precious pearl"—"the precious jewel of virginity and the Church."ⁿ She, he says, "in gathering the flowers of virginity," answers to the good ground in the parable which yielded an hundred-fold, while her sister Paulina, who had died in wedlock, was as that which brought forth thirty-fold, and their mother, the widowed Paula, as that which brought forth sixty-fold.^o With no less zeal he extols Demetrias, a member of the great Anician

A.D. 414.

family, who, with her mother Juliana, had been driven by the calamities of Rome to seek a refuge in Africa. On the eve of the day appointed for her marriage, this "foremost maiden of the Roman world for nobility and wealth"^p declared her resolution to embrace a life of celibacy. Augustine, Jerome, and other eminent teachers wrote to her on the occasion; among them, Pelagius, whose peculiar tenets were then beginning to attract attention, addressed to her, at her mother's request, an elaborate epistle, in which his errors were so strongly expressed that Augustine and Alypius thought it necessary to counteract the effect of it by writing jointly to Juliana.^q "What an exultation was there throughout the whole family!" exclaims Jerome. "As if from a fruitful root, a multitude of virgins sprang up at once, and a crowd of dependents and servants followed the example of their pattern and mistress. Through every house ran a fervour of professing virginity. Nay, I say too little—all the churches throughout Africa danced, as it were, for joy. The fame of the act penetrated not only to cities, towns, and villages, but even to the very tents of the Barbarians. All the islands between Africa and Italy were filled with the rumour; and the rejoicings, unchecked in their progress, ran further and further." He goes on to say that Rome had put off her mourning garments—regarding the "perfect conversion" of her child as a token of divine favour

¹ Ep. xxiv.

^m Ep. cviii. 1.

ⁿ Ibid. 4.

^o Ep. lxvi. 2. This comparison of the three states is frequent with Jerome, and afterwards became current. See, for example, Ælfric's Homilies, i. 149, ed. Thorpe.

^p Ep. cxxx. 1.

^q The letter of Pelagius, which is

printed in vol. xi. of St. Jerome, will be mentioned hereafter. Like Jerome's eulogiums, it was likely to raise a dangerous self-satisfaction in Demetrias. (See especially c. 14.) The letter of Augustine and his friend is the 188th of his epistles. See also Aug. De Gratia et Persever. 23, 40, seqq., for the errors of Pelagius' letter.

towards herself—a compensation for the calamities which she had lately endured; that the shores of the Mediterranean and the regions of the East resounded with celebrations of Demetrias. “Even now,” he tells her, in words which admit of more than one application, “you have received, O virgin, more than you have offered. Whereas only one province had known you as the bride of man, the whole world has heard of you as the virgin of Christ.”^r The constant dwelling on the subject of virginity in writing to such correspondents—the strange, and sometimes grossly indecent,^s comparisons with earthly love by which Jerome illustrates their mystical union with the Heavenly Bridegroom—are singularly at variance with modern ideas of delicacy. Nor, indeed, is it easy to understand why the choice of an unmarried life—which among ourselves is an every-day effect of mere economical prudence—should be extravagantly magnified as the loftiest reach of heroic sanctity.^t

Of the Roman ladies who fell under the influence of Jerome, Paula and her daughter Eustochium are the most intimately connected with his history. Paula was born in 347. Her father was said to be descended from Agamemnon; her mother from the Scipios and the Gracchi.^u Her husband, Toxotius, who traced his lineage through the Julian family to Æneas,^x died in 380, leaving her with a young son of his own name, and with four daughters, Blesilla, Paulina, Eustochium, and Rufina. Paula had already entered on a course of strict religion before she became acquainted with Jerome.^y Eustochium, who had been trained under the care of the noble and pious widow Marcella, was the first Roman maiden of high birth who dedicated her virginity to God.^z At the desire of her uncle Hymetius, his wife, Prætextata, once more attired her after the fashion of this world, in the hope that she might be persuaded to abandon her resolution; but Jerome tells us that in the same night the matron was visited in her sleep by an angel of terrible countenance and voice, who told her that, since she had preferred her husband’s command to Christ’s, the sacrilegious hands which had touched the virgin’s head should wither; that within five months she should be carried

^r Ep. cxxx. 6.^s E. g. Ep. xxii. 25.^t It is always the celibacy that is put forward as the great merit—not the devotion and asceticism which were connected with it.^u Hieron. Ep. cviii. 3; Tillem. xii. 84.^x Ep. cviii. 4.^y Tillem. xii. 85.^z Hieron. Ep. xxii. 15; lxvi. 3; cxxvii. 5.

off to hell ; and, unless she repented forthwith, her husband and sons should be taken from her in one day. These threatenings (he says) were all fulfilled ; and he does not fail to draw a moral for others from the fate of Prætextata.^a

Blesilla, the eldest daughter of Paula, became a widow within seven months after her marriage. On her recovery from a dangerous illness, she devoted herself, by what is styled “a sort of second baptism,”^b to prayer and mortification. Her tears flowed, not for her husband, but for the irreparable forfeiture of the virgin’s crown.^c She learnt Hebrew with wonderful rapidity, and contended with her mother which should commit to memory and chant the greater number of psalms in the original. After three months of this life Blesilla died, her end having apparently been hastened by her austerities. At her funeral, which was conducted with pomp suitable to her rank, Paula was greatly agitated, and was carried home as if dead. The crowd of spectators burst forth into loud cries, “See how she weeps for her child, after having killed her with fasting !” and they were clamorous for the death or banishment of the monks, by whose arts both mother and daughter had been bewitched. Jerome, who was especially aimed at, wrote to reprove Paula for having, by her exhibition of grief, given this occasion to the enemy ; the devil, (he said,) having missed her daughter’s soul, was now attempting to catch her own.^d

In addition to the popular excitement, Jerome had provoked the dislike of many Roman nobles, whose female relatives had been under his guidance. He had also made many enemies among the professed virgins by censuring their inconsistencies in dress and manners,^e and was deeply engaged in quarrels with the clergy, whom he taxed with ignorance, luxury, rapacity, and selfishness ; while they retorted by complaints of his intolerable arrogance.^f Even his ardent admirer Marcella was unable to approve the scorn and asperity with which he treated his opponents ;^g and the satirical letters which he wrote against his brethren were eagerly circulated among the heathen as tending to the disparagement of Christianity altogether.^h By the death of Damasus, in 384, he lost his official employment. He tells that, in the earlier days of his residence at Rome, he had been in the highest estimation, and had even been regarded as worthy to succeed to the bishoprick ;ⁱ but by this time the general opinion had changed. He had made

^a Ep. cvii. 5.^b Ep. xxxix. 3.^f Ep. xxii. 28 ; Baron. 385–9.^c Ep. xxii. 15 ; xxxviii. 4 ; xxxix. 1.^g Ep. xxvii.^d Ep. xxxix. 5 ; Tillem. xii. 87–92.^h Rufin. Apol. ii. 5.^e Ep. xxvii. 2.ⁱ Ep. xlv. 3.

himself unpopular; he was accused of magic, and of improper familiarity with Paula. "What?" he indignantly asks, "was I ever charged with following after silken dresses, glittering jewels, painted faces, or the desire of gold? Was there no other among the Roman matrons who could subdue my mind, but one who is always weeping and fasting, squalid in filthy rags, almost blinded by her tears? one who spends whole nights in supplications to God for mercy; whose songs are the Psalms, whose speech is the Gospel, whose pleasure is continence, whose life is a fast?"^k That his own intractable character had been in any degree to blame for the troubles which had arisen, was an idea which Jerome could neither conceive nor entertain;^l in 385, after a residence of somewhat less than three years, he left Rome in disgust for the East.^m

Paula soon after followed, with Eustochium. Jerome draws an elaborate picture of her kindred, her marriageable daughter Rufina, and the young Toxotius, accompanying her to the place of embarkation, and imploring that she would not abandon them.ⁿ Perhaps indignation may mingle with our other feelings as we read his eulogies on the mistaken heroism which led her, in pursuit of a higher religious life, to cast aside the duties which God and nature had laid upon her.^o

Jerome and Paula met again at Antioch. They spent some time in travelling, together or apart.^p Paula visited, with the greatest devotion, all the holy sites;^q while Jerome employed himself in endeavouring, by the help of local traditions, to bring the topography of Palestine to bear on the illustration of Scripture. From the Holy Land they passed into Egypt, where they sojourned among the Nitrian monks,^r and Jerome attended the lectures of Didymus, the last eminent master of the catechetical school of Alexandria, who, although blind from early childhood, was among the foremost men of his age, not only for genius, but for theological and secular learning.^s In 386-7 the matron and her spiritual guide took up their abode at Bethlehem, then a place of great resort, both for pilgrims from all parts of the Christian world, and for settlers who wished to enjoy such advantages as the neighbourhood of scenes famous in sacred history might be expected to yield for the religious life. Jerome describes in lofty terms the love,

^k Ep. xlv. 3.

^l Schröckh, xi. 83.

^m Tillem. xii. 100.

ⁿ Ep. cviii. 6.

^o "Nesciebat se matrem, ut Christi probaret ancillam."

^p Tillem. xii. 100; Schröckh, xii. 83.

^q Ep. cviii. 8-14.

^r Ep. cviii. 14.

^s Rufin. Hist. Eccl. ii. 7; Tillem. x. 287, seqq.; xii. 83, 102-4; Schröckh, vii. 81.

the harmony, and the mutual forbearance which reigned among the sojourners in the Redeemer's birthplace;^t but his praises were perhaps chiefly founded on the improvement in his own position, as compared with that of his latter days at Rome; and it is certain that, if Bethlehem was at peace when he arrived there, his temper soon introduced the elements of discord.^u

Paula became an object of interest to pilgrims, whose veneration more than compensated for the secular advantages which she had resigned.^x For a time Jerome lived in a small cell. He was supported by Paula, but would accept only the coarsest clothing, with a diet of bread, water, and pulse.^y By selling the remainder of his patrimony, through the agency of his brother Paulinian, whom he sent into the West for the purpose, he was able to build a monastery, in which it is supposed that he took up his abode, and a hospital, which was open to all strangers except heretics, "lest," he said, "Joseph and Mary, if they were to come again to Bethlehem, should again find no room."^z His chief literary occupation was the translation of the Scriptures. While at Rome, he had, at the desire of Damasus, corrected the Latin version of the Gospels by the Greek; he now, in like manner, corrected the Latin of the Old Testament according to the text of the Septuagint exhibited in Origen's Hexapla, which he procured from the library of Cæsarea;^a but he afterwards entered on a greater undertaking, of vast importance for the ages which were to follow^b—a direct translation from the Hebrew. These labours excited great odium against him on the part of persons who ignorantly extended the sacred character of God's word to the defects of the versions which they had been accustomed to use. His correction of the Gospels had contributed to make him unpopular at Rome;^c to improve on the Septuagint—which was supposed to be itself inspired—was regarded as a daring impiety.^d Rufinus, in the bitterness of controversy, denounced Jerome for bringing the knowledge which he had bought from "a Barabbas of the syna-

^t Ep. xlv. 10. Written to Marcella, in the names of Paula and Eustochium.

^u "Cum multis diebus cum eo versatus esset sanctus Posidonius, dicit mihi in aurem, 'Ingenua quidem Paula, quæ ejus curam gerit, præmoriatur, liberata ab ejus invidia. Ut autem arbitror, propter hunc virum non habitabit vir sanctus in his locis, sed ejus pervadet invidia usque ad proprium fratrem.' Resque ita accidit." Pallad. Hist. Laus. 78-9 (Patrol. lxxiii.).

^x Hieron. Ep. cviii. 3.

^y Schröckh, xi. 86.

^z Ep. lxvi. 14; adv. Rufin. iii. 17.

^a De VV. Illustr. 54.

^b On its importance in forming the language of the Latin church, see Ozanam, Civil. Chrét. au 5me Siècle, Leçon xv.

^c Ep. xxvii.

^d Tillem. xii. 94-7, 129-131; Schröckh, ix. 128; xi. 112; Neander, iv. 455.

gogue" to disparage the books which the apostles had delivered to the Church;^e even Augustine wrote to dissuade him from prosecuting his task, on the ground that, after the labours of so many translators, there was probably nothing considerable to be done.^f

By his correspondence Jerome acted as a spiritual director to many religious persons at Rome and elsewhere, while at home he superintended the exercises and employments of Paula and Eustochium. The hours of the pious widow and her daughter were spent in study, devotion, and works of charity; such was their eagerness to penetrate into the meaning of Scripture, that Jerome often found himself perplexed by their pertinacious questionings.^g Paula daily bewailed the vanities of her youth with a profusion of tears;^h even in illness she refused to depart from her custom of lying on the bare floor in a hair shirt, nor would she taste wine, although the advice of her physician was supported by the spiritual authority of Jerome and Epiphanius, bishop of Constantia in Cyprus.ⁱ She built three monasteries for women, and one for men.^k Her property had been greatly reduced by her largesses for religious and charitable purposes before leaving Rome and in the course of her travels; she now gave away the remainder, and, when Jerome remonstrated, she answered that it was her wish to die a beggar, without leaving anything for her daughter, and to be indebted to the charity of others for a shroud.^l Eustochium is celebrated as a model of filial obedience; she never, it is said, slept away from her mother, never ate except in her company, never took a step without her; she never had any money of her own during Paula's lifetime, and, at her death, found herself charged with the maintenance of a multitude of male and female recluses, and burdened with debts which the devout widow had contracted, at high interest, in order to obtain the means for her extravagant alms-deeds.^m

After a residence of nearly twenty years at Bethlehem, Paula died in 404, and was buried in the Church of the Nativity. The

^e Apol. ii. 12, 35-7. Jerome defends himself against the charge of despising the LXX., and cites his prefaces to the books of the Old Testament in disproof of it. Adv. Rufin. ii. 24-34.

^f Ep. xxviii. 2 (or Ep. Hieron. lvi.) In a later letter (Ep. Hier. civ.) Augustine represents the evil results which were likely to follow from the use of a Latin version disagreeing with the Greek. Jerome replies (cxii. 19, seqq.), and Augustine is partly convinced by him. (Ep. Hier. cxvi. 34-5.) For Augustine's views as to the LXX. and other versions,

see De Doctr. Christ. ii. 15.

^g Ep. cviii. 26; Tillem. xii. 127-8.

^h Ep. cviii. 15.

ⁱ Ep. cviii. 20.

^k Ib. 19; Schröckh, viii. 352.

^l Ep. cviii. 18.

^m Ep. cviii. 15, 26-30. "Yea," says Fuller, in his account of Paula, "it is necessary that liberality should have banks, as well as a stream." (Holy State, c. xi.) Jerome says that Eustochium hoped to pay her mother's debts (Ep. cviii. 15)—by what means he does not explain.

funeral rites lasted a week. The bier was borne by bishops; others of that order carried lamps; and the attendance of clergy, monks, and laity was immense. The inscription on the grave, composed by Jerome, set forth the illustrious descent and connexions of Paula, with her sacrifice of all for Christ.ⁿ Eustochium survived her until 419,^o and in the following year Jerome himself died, having attained the age of eighty-nine.^p

The founders of monasticism intended that their disciples should be patterns of the highest Christian life, rather than directly teachers. They were, therefore, originally laymen,^q but by the repute of sanctity they soon gained an influence which raised them into a rivalry with the clergy. Although, for the most part, little qualified by education to judge of theological questions, they were consulted on the highest and the most difficult. Some of them were resorted to as oracles; even the emperor Theodosius, before resolving on war, thought it well to assure himself by the opinion of John, a celebrated solitary of the Thebaid.^r Ecclesiastical office was regarded by many of the monks as inconsistent with the higher spiritual life. Thus St. Martin of Tours considered that his power of miracles was weakened from the time when he left his monastery for the episcopate.^s Pachomius charged his brotherhood to shun ordination as a snare;^t and it is recorded as a saying current in Egypt that "a monk ought to avoid bishops and women; for neither will allow him to rest quietly in his cell, or to devote himself to the contemplation of heavenly things."^u Ammonius, one of the monks who had accompanied Athanasius to Rome, on being chosen for a bishoprick, cut off one of his ears, supposing that, as under the Jewish law, the mutilation would disqualify him, and, on being told that such was not the case, he threatened to cut out his tongue.^v When, however, an abbot named Dracontius, declined a bishoprick as being a hindrance to spiritual improvement, Athanasius strongly combated his view.—"Even when a bishop," he writes, "you may hunger and thirst, and fast as often as Paul. . . . We know of bishops who fast, and of monks who eat; of bishops who abstain from wine, and of monks who

ⁿ Ep. cviii. 28-9, 33.

^o Tillem. xii. 259; Schröckh, viii. 355.

^p Pagi, vii. 209; Tillem. xii. 350. We shall meet with Jerome again in the next two chapters.

^q Bingham, VII. ii. 7; Mosh. i. 308.

^r Cassian. de Cœn. Inst. iv. 23. For

this John, see Rufin. Hist. Mon. i. 1; Pallad. Hist. Laus. 43-6.

^s Sulp. Sev. Dial. ii. 4.

^t Vita, 24.

^u Cass. de Cœn. Inst. xi. 17.

^v Soz. iv. 30; Hist. Laus. 12. Ammonius will be again mentioned in the next chapter.

drink ; of bishops who do miracles, and of monks who do none ; of many bishops who have never married, and of monks who have had children.”^x But, although the original idea of monachism discouraged the reception of ecclesiastical orders, many monks regarded ordination as an advancement, and for that reason sought after it. St. Augustine intimates that these were not always the persons who were most likely to do credit to the clerical office ;^y but even where there was no previous objection on the ground of character, the effect of transferring monks to the ranks of the clergy was often unsatisfactory. St. Chrysostom, a warm advocate of monasticism, mentions that he had known some who made continual progress as monks, but deteriorated when brought into active life as ecclesiastics.^z The monastic training may have failed to prepare them for functions which require a knowledge of men, and a sympathy with human feelings.

There is much that is beautiful and attractive in the idea of monasticism :—a life dedicated to prayer and contemplation, varied by labours for the good of mankind ; a bond of brotherhood, linking together as equals all who should enter into the society, from the man who had resigned rank and wealth, the commander of armies, or the counsellor of emperors, to the emancipated slave ; renunciation of individual possessions for a community of all things, in imitation (as was supposed) of the first Christians after the day of Pentecost. But, while we acknowledge this, and believe that in very many cases the benefits of the monastic institution were largely realized—while we see in the establishment of this system a providential preparation for the ages of darkness, in which it was to be of inestimable service to the Church, to literature, and to civilization—we must notice even thus early some of the evils which were mixed with it. Foremost among these may be placed the danger of the distinction between an ordinary and a more exalted Christian life. This idea St. Chrysostom strongly and frequently opposes. “All men,” he says, “ought to rise to the same height, and that which ruins the whole world is that we imagine a greater strictness to be necessary for the monk alone, but that others may lead careless lives. Indeed it is not so, it is not so ; but we are all required to exercise the same discipline ; and this I very strongly assert,—or rather, not I, but He who will judge us.

* Ath. ad Drac. 9 (t. i. 268) ; Bing-ham, VII. ii. 6 ; Möhler's Athanasius, ii. 137-142. The last words are supposed to relate to some who followed an

ascetic life, yet did not refuse marriage. But does not the context rather show that unchaste monks are meant ?

^y Ep. lx.

^z De Sacerd. iii. 15.

The Saviour's precepts that we should take his yoke upon us, that we should enter into the strait gate, that we should hate the life of this world, and all such like, are not addressed to monks only, but to all."^a But the distinction was too commonly adopted—not only to the relaxation of religion and morals among the multitude, who learnt to devolve the higher duties on the monks, and were led into a general disregard of the divine laws, by finding themselves exempt from the operation of certain rules which claimed a divine authority, such as the monastic precepts on the subject of marriage; but to the danger of those who embraced a course which was thus marked out as far above that required of mankind in general.^b

The institution was not of Christian origin. It was common to eastern religions; the scriptural patterns of it were all drawn from the days of the Old Testament—Elijah, the Rechabites, St. John the Baptist;^c a New Testament warrant for it was only to be found by violently distorting the meaning of some passages, or magnifying them beyond their due proportion.^d The monk was to avoid those trials of life for the bearing of which grace is promised, and was to cast himself on other trials, for which he might possibly be unfit. He was placed in hostility not only to the corruption and evil of the world, but to that which is good in it. He was to renounce its charities and its discipline; he was to become a stranger to his natural affections.^e Antony himself believed it a duty to overcome his love for his sister, whom, after their early parting, he never saw again until she had become an aged abbess;^f and we have seen how Pachomius disowned the ties of kindred. Pior, a disciple of Antony, on leaving his father's house, vowed that he would never again look on any of his relations. After he had spent fifty years in the desert, his sister discovered that he was still alive; she was too infirm to seek him out, but her earnest entreaties set in motion the authority of his superiors, and Pior was ordered to visit her. Having arrived in front of her dwelling, he sent her notice of his presence. As the door opened he closed his eyes, and held them obstinately closed throughout the meeting; and, having allowed his sister to see him in this fashion, he refused to enter her house, and hurried back to the desert.^g Another monastic hero, on receiving a large packet

^a Adv. Oppugnatores Vitæ Monasticæ, 3 (t. i. pp. 102-3).

^b Neander, Memorials, 189; Gieseler, I. ii. 306-323.

^c Hieron. Ep. lviii. 5.

^d Schröckh, ix. 161; Neander, iii. 323.

^e See Basil. Resp. 2; and a story of Antony, Cassian. Coll. xxiv. 11.

^f Athan. Vita Anton. 54.

^g Pallad. Hist. Laus. 87. The behaviour of St. Pæmen and his brothers to their mother was remarkable in the same way. Tillem. xv. 157.

of letters from his home, with which he had held no communication for fifteen years, burnt it without opening it, lest the contents should distract his mind by suggesting remembrances of the writers.^h A still more extraordinary example of the manner in which the monks were expected to deaden their natural feelings was given by one Mucius. On his desiring admission into a monastery with his son, a boy eight years old, they were compelled, by way of trial, to remain long without the gate. The constancy with which this was borne prevailed on the monks to admit them, although children were usually excluded; but their probation was not yet ended. They were separated from each other, the child was illtreated in every way, was dressed in rags, kept in a disgustingly filthy state, and often beaten without any cause. Mucius made no remonstrance; and at length, on being told to throw his son into the river, he obeyed this command also. The child was saved, and it was revealed to the abbot of the house that his new inmate was a second Abraham.ⁱ

The overstrained and misdirected idea of obedience which appears in the case of Mucius, runs through the whole history of early monachism. The applicants for admission were required to approve themselves by submitting to insults, contempt, harsh usage, and degrading employments;^k the faith and patience of the monks were tried by the imposition of wearisome and preposterous labours. Thus it is related that John, the same whose responses afterwards directed the policy of Theodosius, was commanded by his abbot to remove a huge rock, and struggled at the manifestly hopeless task until he was worn out by the violence of his exertions. At another time he was ordered to water a dry stick twice a-day; and for a year he faithfully persisted in the work, toiling, whether sick or well, through all the inclemencies of the seasons, to fetch the water twice a-day from a distance of two miles. On being asked, at length, by his superior, whether the plant had struck root, the monk completed his obedience by modestly answering that he did not know; whereupon the abbot, pulling up the stick, released him from his task.^l In such narratives it seems to be expected that we should admire not only

^h Cass. de Cœn. Inst. v. 32.

ⁱ Cass. de Cœn. Inst. iv. 27-8. The editor, Gazé, while his natural feeling is revolted by the story, says that, as the whole was approved by a vision, the abbot must have been divinely prompted in the trials to which he subjected Mucius and his son.

^k Cass. de Cœn. Inst. iv. 3; Basil.

Regula, 10.

^l Cass. ib. 24-6. Sulp. Severus tells a similar story; but in it the watering is continued for three years, at the end of which the monk's obedience is rewarded by the shooting of the wood, which Sulpicius professes to have seen as a flourishing shrub. Dial. i. 18.

the endurance of the Christian Hercules, but the execrable tyranny of the monastic taskmaster.

The zeal with which St. Ambrose taught that virginity ought to be embraced in defiance of the will of parents has already been mentioned.^m St. Jerome is yet more extravagant. "Although," he writes, in exhorting Heliodorus to become a hermit, "your little nephew should hang about your neck; although your mother, with hair dishevelled and garments rent, should show you the breasts at which she nourished you; although your father should lie on the threshold;—trample on your father, and set out! Fly with dry eyes to the banner of the cross! The only kind of piety is to be cruel in this matter."ⁿ

An over-valuation of celibacy already called down the censure of some councils. That of Gangra^o anathematises those who condemn marriage as if it were inconsistent with salvation; it forbids virgins to exalt themselves above the married, and orders that women should not forsake their husbands, as if matrimony were unholy.^p The whole tone of its canons is directed against the error of making a higher religion the pretext for the neglect of natural and ordinary duties.^q Other councils forbade the reception of married persons into monasteries without the consent of their partners, and the profession of celibacy by women before the age of mature understanding. The Council of Saragossa (A.D. 381) fixes this at forty; the Third Council of Carthage (A.D. 397) at twenty-five; St. Basil, without naming any particular age, requires that the profession shall be the effect of a settled and independent resolution.^r

Some monks lived entirely for contemplation and devotion, depending on others for food—as Paul, called the Simple, a monk of Scetis, who said three hundred prayers a-day, keeping the account of them by pebbles.^s But in general, the need of some

^m P. 319.

ⁿ Ep. xiv. 2. Although, in Ep. lii. 1, Jerome speaks of the letter to Heliodorus as written when he was a young man, and as too rhetorical, he at a later time praises Fabiola for having known it by heart, and acted on it (Ep. lxxvii. 9). Compare a strange medley of Scriptural metaphors in Ep. xxii. 24 (ad Eustoch.). St. Hilary of Poitiers is not answerable for the conduct which is related as to his praise by a writer of the sixth or seventh century—that when he returned from exile, finding his daughter inclined to marry, he prayed that she might be taken from the world, and was

heard in his petition! Vita Hil. i. 6, 13 (Patrol. ix., or lxxxviii. 442-6); Tillem. vii. 449.

^o See above, p. 311.

^p Cc. 1, 9, 10, 14.

^q Canon 13 forbids women to assume male attire under the pretext of continence—a practice which St. Jerome also mentions. Ep. xxii. 27.

^r Conc. Cæsaraug. c. 8; Conc. III. Carthag. c. 4 (Labbe, ii. 1167); Basil. Resp. xv. 4.

^s This Paul told the younger Macarius that, while he prayed three hundred times daily, a certain virgin prayed seven hundred times, and expressed distress at being so much outdone by ■

additional occupation was felt by the fathers of monasticism.^t It was a saying that "a monk employed is beset by one devil, but an idle monk by a whole legion."^u The industrial occupations prescribed for the monks, however, were not in general such as very thoroughly to occupy them.^x There was, after all, much vacant time, and, although some of the monks cultivated learning, there was in most cases a want of mental resources for the profitable use of leisure.^y Antony, indeed, when a philosopher asked him how he could live without books, was able to reply that for him the whole creation was a book, always at hand, in which he could read God's word whensoever he pleased.^z But this capacity for the contemplative life was not universal among the multitude who embraced the monastic profession—some, from a mere spirit of imitation; others from disappointment in love or in ambition, from excited feelings of remorse, or in consequence of a sudden shock; some from a wish to distinguish themselves, and to gain the reputation of holiness; some, from a disinclination to earn their support by any active calling.^a The means which were taken to avoid temptation rather served to excite it, by placing always before the mind the duty of combating certain forms in which it might appear. Thoughts of blasphemy and visions of impurity are continually mentioned in the histories of monks.^b Many were driven into positive insanity by solitude and excessive abstinence, working on enthusiastic temperaments;^c many to despair, with thoughts of suicide, which were sometimes carried into act.^d The biographies are full of fights with devils, visions,

person of the weaker sex. Macarius very sensibly replied, "*I pray only one hundred times a-day, and my conscience never reproaches me on that account: if your conscience reproaches you, either you do not pray with your heart, or you might pray oftener*" (Pallad. Hist. Laus. 23-4). To this may be added a story told by Cassian:—On the introduction of the cœnobitic system into Egypt, under St. Mark (for Cassian supposes the Therapeutæ to have been Christian cœnobites), some monks were for requiring fifty, sixty, or even a greater number of psalms to be chanted at a service; when one day while the brethren were seated in church, according to the Egyptian custom, one of the company stood up, sang *twelve* psalms, and then vanished. The monks concluded that their visitor was an angel, and fixed the number of psalms at that which he had sanctioned. De Cœn. Inst. ii. 5.

^t Hieron. Ep. cxxv. 11; Cass. Collat. xxiv. 4, 12-3.

^u Cass. de Cœn. Inst. x. 23.

^x Schröckh, v. 133-5.

^y See Aug. Ep. xlviii.; Schröckh, viii. 216.

^z Soc. iv. 23.

^a See a doubtful epistle ascribed to Gregory the Great, ix. 52; Neand. iii. 358-9, 368; vii. 326, 331-9; Gieseler, I. ii. 235.

^b Rosweyde, l. iii.; l. v. 5; Theiner, i. 301; Gieseler, I. ii. 352-3. See a curious story in Hieron. Ep. cxxv. 13.

^c See, e. g. the story of Ptolemy, Hist. Laus. 33.

^d Hieron. Ep. cxxv. 16, cxxx. 17; Cass. Coll. ii. 5-8; Nilus, Ep. ii. 140 (t. ii. p. 183, ed. Suarez, Rom. 1668); Neand. iii. 337-8; Theiner, i. 162; Gieseler, I. ii. 234-5. See Burton, Anat. of Melancholy, ii. 510-2, ed. Lond. 1827.

and miracles—especially cures of demoniacs, raisings of the dead and compelling them to speak.^e The brute creatures play a large part in the miraculous tales. Thus it is said that the younger Macarius was visited by a lioness, who laid her blind cubs at his feet, that they might receive their sight. The saint, after praying, performed the work; and the mother expressed her gratitude by a present of sheepskins.^f It would be difficult to determine in how far these stories are true; how far the phantasies of excited imaginations may have been mistaken for realities; how far ordinary things have been exaggerated into the miraculous; or how far the accounts are mere falsehoods, invented for the glory of the heroes and of the institution.

With many the outward imitation of the founders of monachism was all in all, while unhappily the spirit which preserved such men as Antony from the evils of their system was wanting. Austerities, frightful to think of,^g were too often combined with a want of true Christian faith and purity of heart. Many monks fancied themselves above needing the ordinances of grace; many relapsed from an overstrained asceticism into self-indulgent habits. Spiritual pride and fanaticism abounded.^h And often it was found that the love of earthly things, which was supposed to have been overcome by embracing the monastic state, revived in new and subtle forms; as we are told that many who had renounced wealth and splendour became chary of a knife, a style, a needle, or a pen; that they would not let any one even touch their books, and for such trifles were ready to break out into violent anger.ⁱ

After a time, monks, forgetting the original object of their institution, began to flock into towns, for the sake of the gifts and other advantages which such places offered. This was forbidden in 390 by a law of Theodosius, issued, it is said, at the instigation of judges, who found the visitors apt to interfere with the course of justice.^k Two years later the law was relaxed to the

^e Schröckh, viii. 293; Gieseler, I. ii. 234-5.

^f Rufin. Hist. Mon. ii. 4. See the curious book entitled 'Die Heiligen,' i. 291 (Leipz. 1791). Bede relates that a penitent raven presented St. Cuthbert with a large piece of lard, by way of atonement for having pulled some straw out of his roof in order to build a nest. Vita Cuthb. 20. (Patrol. xciv.)

^g Thus Macarius the Younger, having killed a gnat, resolved to do penance by living naked for six months in the Scetic morass, where the gnats were as

large as wasps. At the end of the time he was so disfigured by them that he could only be known by his voice. Heraclides, Parad. 6 (Patrol. lxxiv. 270). On this subject, see Theiner, i. 98-100.

^h Cass. de Coen. Inst. l. xi. "De Cenodoxia;" l. xii. "De Superbia;" Schröckh, viii. 347; Möhler's Athanasius, ii. 89-90; Neand. iii. 337-8, 360-3.

ⁱ Cass. Coll. i. 6; iv. 21.

^k Cod. Theod. XVI. iii. 1. See above (p. 299), and Godefroy's comment on the

extent of allowing them to repair to cities for the redress of judicial wrongs.¹ The credulity and liberality of the inhabitants were practised on by hypocritical monks, who affected strange dress and savage manners,—loading themselves with heavy chains, exhibiting pretended relics, and telling outrageous fictions of adventures which they professed to have had with evil spirits,—while their private life was spent in luxury and profligacy.^m

Few of the monks were able even to read; and in them the ignorance which would have been despised in the clergy was admired as a token of sanctity.ⁿ In consequence of their ignorance they were liable to be swayed by any one who might get possession of their minds. Their partisanship was violent; they denounced any deviation from their own narrow views as utterly anti-Christian;^o and, although in the Arian and Apollinarian controversies they did good service, it was often in a rude and improper manner. They interfered tumultuously in the elections of bishops.^p Crowds of them went about in the East, destroying temples; and, as such were the specimens of the monastic class which came into contact with the Pagans, we cannot wonder that their illiteracy and their lawless fury excited in these strong feelings of disgust and detestation. The description given of them by Libanius has been already quoted.^q The emperor Julian can find nothing worse to say against the pretenders to the character of cynics than that they are like the class of “renunciants”^r among the “Galileans,” who, by giving up such trifles as they possess, acquire wealth, state,^s and reverence. In like manner Eunapius speaks of the monks as leading a “swinish life;” he says that any one who chooses to dress in black and to disregard public decency, may acquire a tyrannic power; and he charges them with getting a large portion of the soil into their possession under pretence of helping the poor.^t If a comparison

law; also a law of Leo and Anthemius, A.D. 466, Cod. Just. I. iii. 29.

¹ “Dum judiciariis aguntur injuriis.” (C. Th. ib. 2.) Whether this means that they were to defend themselves or others from judicial wrong, is disputed. See Godefroy.

^m Hieron. Ep. xxii. 28; cxxv. 16; Aug. de Opere Monach. 36; Bingham, VII. iii. 6; Gieseler, I. ii. 254. There was in Egypt a class of monks called Sarabaites or Remoboth, who lived in towns, in companies of two or three—apparently corrupt imitators of the earlier ascetics. They are described as worthless and proud—selling their work

at extravagant prices, and abusing the clergy. (Cass. Coll. xviii. 4; Bened. Regula, c. 1 and notes, in Patrol. lxxvi.; Bingham, VIII. ii. 4; Schröckh, v. 169, viii. 365-6.) On account of this last feature, Neander (iii. 350-1) is inclined to take up their cause against the general consent of writers.

ⁿ Soz. iv. 28; Schröckh, v. 156.

^o Giesel. I. ii. 242; Neand. iii. 358-9.

^p Gieseler, I. ii. 243. ^q P. 276.

^r ἀποτακτιστάς. Orat. vii. p. 224.

^s τὸ δορυφορεῖσθαι.

^t Vita Ædesii, quoted by Gieseler, I. ii. 242. Zosimus brings like charges, v. 23.

with the Circumcellions, which St. Augustine is very eager to refute,^u was undeserved by the monks of Northern Africa, it would have done but little injustice to those of some other regions.

The monastic spirit soon began to exhibit itself in extravagant forms. Thus the *Boscoi*, or grazers, whose manner of life originated in Mesopotamia, but was afterwards imitated in Palestine, dwelt in mountains or deserts without any roof to shelter them—exposed, almost entirely naked, to the heat and to the cold, and browsing on grass and herbs until, both in body and in mind, they lost the likeness of humanity.^x Others of these Christian fakeers, after having professedly attained a perfection superior to all human feelings, used, by way (as it was interpreted) of showing their contempt for worldly glory, to feign madness, and to astonish the inhabitants of cities by ostentatious displays of ridiculous and unseemly behaviour.^y And in the beginning of the fifth century appeared the fanaticism of the *Stylites*, or pillar-saints.

The first of these, Symeon,^z a native of the country on the borders of Syria and Cilicia, was employed in boyhood to tend his father's sheep; but, having been induced by some words which he heard in church to resolve on embracing a religious life, he entered a strict monastery at the age of thirteen, and remained there for nine years. His abstinences and other mortifications excited the wonder and admiration of the monks. One day, on being sent to draw water, he took the rough palm-rope of the monastic well, bound it tightly round him, and pretended that he had been unable to find it. At the end of a fortnight, the secret was betrayed by the drops of blood which the rope forced out from his flesh; and, on examination, it was found to have eaten into his body so deeply that it could hardly be seen. Symeon bore without a groan the torture of having it extracted, but would not allow any remedies to be applied to his wounds; and the abbot thereupon begged that he would leave the monastery, lest his severities should raise a spirit of emulation which might be dangerous to the weaker brethren.^a Symeon then withdrew to a place about forty miles from Antioch, where he lived for ten years in a sort of narrow pen; after which he built a pillar, and took up his position on the top of it, which was only about a yard in diameter.^b He removed successively from one

^u Enarr. in Psalm. cxxxii. 3.

^v Soz. iv. 33; Evagr. i. 21.

^y Evagr. i. 21. Comp. his accounts of two who feigned folly, iv. 34-5.

^z Ib. i. 13; Schröckh, viii. 227, seqq.

^a Vita Sym. 1-3 (Patrol. lxxiii. 326); Theodoret. Philotheus, c. 26 (ib. lxxiv. 100). These accounts are of a very legendary kind.

^b This seems a necessary correction of *perimeter* in Evagrius, which would

pillar to another, always increasing the height, which in the last of them was forty cubits;^e and in this way he spent thirty-seven years.^d His life is compared to that of angels—offering up prayers for men from his elevated station, and bringing down graces on them.^e His neck was loaded with an iron chain. In praying, he bent his body so that his forehead almost touched his feet; a spectator once counted twelve hundred and forty-four repetitions of this movement, and then lost his reckoning.^f He took only one scanty meal a-week, and fasted throughout the season of Lent.^g He uttered prophecies, and wrought an abundance of miracles.^h

Some time after he had adopted this peculiar manner of life, a neighbouring society of monks sent to ask why he was not content with such fashions of holiness as had sufficed for the saints of earlier days. The messenger was charged to bid him leave his pillar, and, in case of a refusal, to pull him down by force. But Symeon, on hearing the order, put forth one of his feet, as if to descend; and the messenger, as he had been instructed, acknowledged this obedience as a proof that the Stylite's mode of life was approved by God, and desired him to continue in it.ⁱ

Symeon's fame became immense. Pilgrims from distant lands—from Persia and Ethiopia, from Spain, Gaul, and even from Britain—flocked to see him,^k and during his own lifetime little figures of him were set up in the workshops of Rome, as charms against evil.^l The king of Persia sent ambassadors to him;^m he corresponded with bishops and emperors, and influenced the policy both of church and state, while, by his life and his exhortations, he converted multitudes of Saracens and other nomads of the desert.ⁿ

At length the devil appeared to Symeon in the form of an angel, and in the name of God invited him to ascend, like Elijah, in a fiery chariot, to the company of angels and saints who were

allow only a foot for the diameter (Tillem. xv. 361, 365; Gibbon, iii. 356). Theodoret says that Symeon betook himself to the pillar in order to escape the pressure of the crowds which were desirous to touch him. (l. c. col. 103.)

^c Tillem. xv. 361.

^d Baronius, 460. 17, says eighty years; but Pagi, in his note, shows that this is a mistake.

^e Evagr. i. 13. ^f Theod. l. c. 107.

^g So Tillemont (xv. 358, 365) construes words which others have supposed

to mean that he never ate more than once in forty days. Comp. Theod. l. c. 101; Dupin, iv. 99.

^h Tillem. xv. 370.

ⁱ Evagr. i. 14. Theodore the Reader says that the monks of Egypt excommunicated him for his innovation, but afterwards, on becoming acquainted with his virtues, embraced his communion. ii. 41.

^k Theod. l. c. col. 102. ^l Ib. 103.

^m Ib. col. 106.

ⁿ Ib. 104; Vita, 5; Evagr. i. 14.

eager to welcome him. Symeon raised his right foot to enter the chariot, but at the same time made the sign of the cross, on which the tempter vanished. In punishment of his presumption, the devil afflicted him with an ulcer in his thigh, and Symeon, by way of penance, resolved that the foot which he had put forth should never again touch his pillar, but for the remaining year of his life supported himself on one leg.^o Symeon died in 460, at the age of seventy-two; and we are told that around the spot which had long been his abode, all nature mourned his departure. The birds wheeled about his pillar, uttering doleful cries; men and beasts filled the air with their groans to a distance of many miles; while the mountains, the forests, and the plains were enveloped in a dense and sympathetic gloom. An angel with a countenance like lightning, and in raiment white as snow, appeared discoursing with seven elders in awful tones, of which the words could not be distinguished; and as the precious body was carried to Antioch, to serve the city as a defence, instead of the walls which had been lately overthrown by an earthquake, a multitude of miracles marked its way.^p

On Symeon's death, a disciple named Sergius, in obedience to his desire, carried his cowl to the emperor Leo; but, as the emperor did not appear to be sufficiently impressed by the announcement of the legacy, Sergius bestowed it on Daniel, a monk of Mesopotamian birth, whose sanctity had already been attested by many miracles.^q Daniel had formerly visited Symeon;^r he was now urged by visions to imitate his manner of life, and set up a pillar in a spot which had been indicated by a dove, about four miles north of Constantinople. The owner of the soil, whose leave had not been asked, complained of this invasion to Leo and to the patriarch Gennadius; and Gennadius, envious of Daniel's holiness,^s or suspecting him of vanity, was about to dislodge him, when miracles were wrought in vindication of the Stylite's motives. Daniel was therefore allowed to retain his position, and, after some time, Gennadius, whose suspicions were not yet extinct, was directed by a vision to ordain him to the priesthood. The Stylite professed himself unworthy, and would not allow the patriarch to approach him; but Gennadius, standing at the foot of the pillar,

^o Vita, 6-7. Neander supposes that the temptation may have passed in Symeon's imagination (iii. 365). Perhaps we may rather consider the story as invented for the sake of the moral—which seems too healthy to have oc-

curred to the Stylite himself.

^p Vita, 17-21; Evagr. i. 14.

^q Sym. Metaphrastes, in Surius, Acta Sanctorum, vi. 850 (Dec. 11), ed. Colon. 1575.

^r Ib. 847.

^s Ib. 851.

went through the form of ordination. Daniel then ordered that a ladder should be brought; the patriarch mounted to the top of the column, administered the eucharist to the newly-ordained priest, and received it at his hands.^t For thirty-three years A.D. 461- Daniel continued to occupy his pillar, until he died at 494. the age of eighty.^u By continually standing his feet were covered with sores and ulcers;^v and his disciples in vain endeavoured to discover by what nourishment he supported life. The high winds of Thrace sometimes stripped him of his scanty clothing, and almost blew him from his place, and sometimes he was covered for days with snow and ice, until Leo forcibly enclosed the top of his pillar with a shed.^x Like Symeon, he was supposed to possess the gifts of prophecy and miracles; he was regarded as an oracle of heaven, and was visited with reverence by kings and emperors.^y It is said that through all the temptations to pride which he so laboriously courted, Daniel was able to preserve his humility; and, although general assertions of this kind carry little weight, perhaps a better evidence may be found in the statement that he discouraged all who approached him with complaints against their bishops.^z

Although the Stylite manner of life was regarded by some teachers as vainglorious and unprofitable,^a Symeon found many imitators in Syria, where Stylites are mentioned as late as the twelfth century. But, except in a very few cases, this fashion does not appear to have been adopted in other countries.^b When one Wulfilaich, towards the end of the sixth century, attempted to practise it in the district of Treves, the neighbouring bishops ordered his pillar to be demolished.^c It would seem, however, that an English pilgrim of the eighth century saw two Stylites near Miletus.^d

V. *Rites and Usages.*

(1.) The more general adoption of Christianity was followed by an increase of splendour in all that concerned the worship of God. Churches were built and adorned with greater cost; the officiating clergy were attired in rich dresses;^e the music became more elabo-

^t Ib. 854.^u Ib. 865.^v Ib. 851, 854.^x Ib. 856-7; Baron. 465. 12.^y Surius, vi. 851, seqq. 864; Baron. 464. 3.^z Tillem. xvi. 445.^a See the admonitions of Nilus to a stylite, Epp. ii. 114-5 (about A.D. 430).^b Evagr. i. 13; Schröckh, viii. 231; Gieseler, I. ii. 247.^c Greg. Turon. viii. 15.^d Peregr. Willibaldi, 7, ap. Canis. *Lectioes Antiq.* ii. 109. Some would read *silice* for *stulite*.^e See Augusti, xi. 299, seqq.

rate, and many new ceremonies were introduced.^f But, praiseworthy as was the design of making the outward service as worthy of its object as the means of the worshippers would allow, there crept in with the change serious evils, which even already began to have their effects. Multitudes were drawn into the Church by the conversion of the emperor, without any sufficient understanding of their new profession—with minds still possessed by heathen notions, and corrupted by the general depravation of heathen morality.^g The governors of the Church attempted to recommend the Gospel to such converts by ceremonies which might rival those of their old religion, and so, it was hoped, might attract them to the true and saving essentials with which the Christian ceremonies were connected. But, unhappily, Christianity itself lost in the process—not only being discredited by unworthy professors, but becoming affected in its doctrines and practices by heathenism.^h Pagan usages were adopted,ⁱ—the burning of candles by daylight (which, even so recently as the time of Lactantius,^k had been a subject of ridicule for the Christian controversialists), incense, lustrations, and the like;^l and there was indeed too much foundation for the reproach with which the Manichæan Faustus assailed the Church:—“The sacrifices of the heathen you have turned into lovefeasts; their idols into martyrs, whom you worship with similar devotions; you propitiate the shades of the dead with wine and dainties; the solemn days of the Gentiles you keep with them, as the Kalends and the solstices; and certain it is that you have changed nothing from their manner of life.”^m A merely external performance of duties, as it was all that heathenism required, came to be regarded by many as sufficient in Christianity also,ⁿ and bounty to the Church was supposed to cover the guilt of sins.^o St. Augustine says that an ordinary Christian who professed any seriousness in spiritual things had as much to endure from the mockery of his brethren as a convert to Christianity from that of the heathen.^p

^f Mosh. i. 374; Schröckh, v. 122; Gieseler, I. ii. 291–2.

^g Gieseler, I. ii. 314; Neand. Memorials, 119–121.

^h Mosh. i. 347, 369; Schröckh, ix. 292–3.

ⁱ See Conyers Middleton's Letter from Rome, and Professor Blunt's Vestiges of Ancient Manners and Customs in Italy and Sicily (Lond. 1823). The respected Margaret Professor of our own time is in the Roman Index of Prohibited Books, as well as the questionable divine of the last century.

^k “Accendunt lumina [Deo] quasi

in tenebris agenti.” Lact. Div. Inst. vi. 2 (Patrol. vi).

^l These came in gradually. Incense had been censured by Arnobius (vii. 26, Patrol. v.). It is spoken of by St. Athanasius in a passage quoted above, p. 295, n. o, but seemingly in a figurative sense only. The beginning of the actual use is referred to the fifth century. Schröckh, v. 122; ix. 294–5; Gieseler, I. ii. 291.

^m Faust. ap. Aug. c. Faust. xx. 4.

ⁿ Gieseler, I. ii. 261.

^o Neand. iii. 401.

^p Enarr. in Psalm. xlvi. serm. ii. 4; in Ps. xc. serm. i. 4.

And we have already had occasion to notice the unfavourable effect which the monastic institution produced on the religion of men engaged in secular life.^a

Many persons were found at church for the great Christian ceremonies, and at the theatres, or even at the temples, for the heathen spectacles.^r The ritual of the Church was viewed as a theatrical exhibition. The sermons were listened to as the displays of rhetoricians; and eloquent preachers were cheered with clapping of hands, stamping of feet, waving of handkerchiefs, cries of "Orthodox!" "Thirteenth Apostle!" and other like demonstrations, which such teachers as Chrysostom and Augustine often tried to restrain, in order that they might persuade their flocks to a more profitable manner of hearing.^s Some went to church only in time for the sermon, alleging that they could pray at home.^t And when the more attractive parts of the service were over, the great mass of the people departed, without remaining for the administration of the Eucharist, which in the first ages had usually been received by the whole congregation.^u The doctrinal controversies also, which occupy so large a space in the history of the century, acted unfavourably on its religious tone, by bringing the highest mysteries of the faith into idle discussion, and by throwing into the background the necessity of a practically religious life.^x

Usages which had grown up insensibly were now fixed by express regulations; and by this and the other means which have been mentioned, the ritual system was so overlaid with rules and ceremonies as to give occasion for St. Augustine's celebrated complaint, "that they were grown to such a number that the estate of Christian people was in worse case concerning that matter than were the Jews."^y Things which would have been good either as expressions of devotion or as means of training for it, became, through their multiplication, and through the importance which was attached to them, too likely to be regarded as independent ends.

^a P. 332.

^r Salvian de Gub. Dei, vi. 7; Beugnot, i. 380.

^s Bingham XIV. iv. 27; Mosh. i. 372; Schrockh, x. 318-324.

^t Chrys. de incomprens. Dei Nat. 6 (t. i. p. 469); Neand. iii. 449.

^u Ib.; Gieseler, I. ii. 320. "In vain," says St. Chrysostom, contrasting the neglect of ordinary communion with the crowds which flocked to the Eucharist at Easter, "*we stand at the altar to administer the sacrament; you remain*

aloof" (Hom. iii. in Ep. ad Ephes. p. 133, ed. Field.). "Hence the communion of the clergy sometimes without the people, although they remained present." Bunsen, Hippolytus, ed. 1. vol. ii. 195.

^x Gieseler, I. ii. 322; Neand. iii. 318.

^y Ep. lv. 19, as translated in Pref. to English Prayer-Book. His reason is, that the Jewish burdens were imposed by a Divine law, but the others by human authority.

(2.) The heathen temples were in some cases turned into churches;^z but, intended as they were for a ritual which was chiefly carried on in the open courts, and of which addresses to the people formed no part, their structure was ill suited for Christian worship. The type of churches was taken from buildings of another kind, the *basilicas*, and the name itself was adopted into Christian use, as signifying the dwelling-places of the Almighty King.^a These buildings were oblong, and were usually separated by two ranges of pillars into a middle part or nave, with an aisle on each side.^b At the farther end was a portion styled in Greek *bema*, and in Latin *tribuna*, distinguished from the rest by the elevation of its floor, and terminating in a semicircular projection, called the *absis* or *apse*. The lower portion of the building was used as a sort of exchange; in the bema stood the tribunal of the judge, with an altar before it.^c These arrangements were easily accommodated to the purposes of worship, whether in basilicas which were given up to the Church, or in new buildings erected on the same plan.^d

At Constantinople, from the foundation of the city, a new form of ecclesiastical architecture was employed—its chief characteristics being the cruciform plan, and the cupola which soared upwards from the intersection of the cross, as if in imitation of the canopy of heaven. This style in later times not only prevailed throughout the Greek Church, including the countries of the Slavonic race, but was introduced by Justinian at Ravenna, and, through the influence of the Ravennese examples, affected other parts of Western Europe.^e

Contrary to the custom which was afterwards practised among the Teutonic nations, the early churches usually fronted the east.^f Paulinus of Nola mentions this arrangement, and tells us that he himself, in building a church to the honour of St. Felix, deviated from it by turning the front towards the patron's tomb.^g

The part of a church nearest to the entrance was the *narthex*, or *vestibule*, occupied by penitents and catechumens, and open to

^z Bingham, VIII. ii. 4; Augusti, xi. 351.

^a See, as to basilicas, Hope on Architecture, pp. 78, seqq.; Lord Lindsay on Christian Art, i. 11, seqq.; Fergusson's Handbook of Architecture, pt. I. b. vii. c. 4; pt. II. b. i. c. 2.

^b The basilica of Trajan has a double row of pillars, that at Treves is without pillars. See Mr. Fergusson's illustra-

tions.

^c Hope, 79; Lindsay, i. 12; Broglie, ii. 171.

^d Bingham, VIII. i. 5; Gieseler, I. ii. 285; Milman, ii. 412-5; iii. 488-490.

^e Lindsay, i. 62, seqq.; Fergusson, 944, seqq.

^f Fergusson, 516.

^g Ep. xxxii. 13 (Patrol. lxi.).

all comers. This was separated by the “beautiful gates”^h from the *naos*, *navis* (ship), or *nave*, in which the “faithful” were placed; at the upper end of the nave, in a place corresponding to that which in secular basilicas was appropriated to the bar, was the *choir*,ⁱ slightly raised above the level of the nave, and separated by a railing^k from the innermost portion of the church, the *bema*, or *sanctuary*.^l From the time of Constantine, the wooden altars of the primitive church began to be superseded by stone. The introduction of this material is ascribed to Sylvester of Rome, but without any certain authority. The change appears to have been completely established before the times of Gregory Nyssen and Chrysostom.^m

Women were seated apart from the menⁿ—sometimes in enclosed galleries,^o an arrangement which was especially followed in eastern countries. The church was usually surrounded by a court, containing the lodgings of the clergy and other buildings, among which, in cathedrals and other greater churches, was the baptistery.^p Churches were now dedicated with great solemnity, and the anniversary of the consecration was celebrated.^q

(3.) The arts of painting and sculpture now began to be taken into the service of the Gospel. This change, however, did not originate with the clergy. Eusebius of Cæsarea, in the early part of the century, expressed himself strongly against the attempt to represent the holy personages of Scripture—saying that the glory of the Saviour cannot be represented, and that the true image of the saints is a saintly life.^r Epiphanius, bishop of Constantia in

^h The use of this term seems to have varied. See Neale's *Eastern Church*, *Intro.* i. 197–8.

ⁱ Caumont, *Abécédaire d'Archéologie*, i. 9.

^k *κυκλῖδες*, *cancelli*.

^l Bingham, *VIII.* iii.; Gieseler, *I.* ii. 285. See Freeman's *Hist. of Architecture*, 157; Neale, i. 175–6, 194; Ferguson, 483.

^m Augusti, *viii.* 169.

ⁿ Aug. de *Civ. Dei*, ii. 28.

^o Milman, *iii.* 490; Lindsay, i. 14; Neale, i. 206. Mr. Hope says that the male and female candidates for justice were separated in the aisles of the basilicas, p. 79.

^p Bingham, *VIII.* vii.; Augusti, *xi.* 398–406; Lindsay, i. 31.

^q Bingham, *VIII.* ix.; Neander, *iii.* 403.

^r The letter of Eusebius to Constantia is partly quoted in the second council

of Nicæa (*Hard.* iv. 405), but is given most fully in the *Spicilegium Solesmense*, i. 383–6. He says (p. 386) that the followers of Simon Magus were said to have worshipped images of the heresiarch, and that he himself had seen an image of Manes which was honoured by the Manichæans; but that such things were to be rejected by Christians. In his *History* he mentions images at Paneas which were believed to represent the Saviour and the Syrophœnician woman, and supposes them to be of heathen production, since the heathens were accustomed to express gratitude for benefits by erecting such memorials (*vii.* 18). Nicæphorus, patriarch of Constantinople in the ninth century (see *Book IV. c. i. s. 2*), argues for images against Eusebius in a treatise which is published in the *Spicilegium*, and decries his authority on the ground that he was an Arian.

Cyprus (whose name will again come before us), while travelling in the Holy Land, in 394, tore a curtain which he found hanging before the sanctuary of a church, with a figure either of the Saviour or of a saint painted on it—declaring such representations to be contrary to Scripture.^s But the account of the incident shows that new views as to their lawfulness had already obtained a footing among Christians. It was usual to depict subjects from the Old Testament as figurative of their evangelical antitypes: thus the water from the rock was employed to signify Baptism; Moses bringing the manna from heaven represented the Eucharist; the sacrifice of Isaac, the Crucifixion.^t In addition to these symbolical pictures, the walls of many churches were covered with martyrdoms and scriptural scenes, and wealthy persons had their garments embroidered with subjects of the same kind.^u It was not, however, until the very end of the century that single figures were thus painted—a kind of pictures the most likely to attract the honour which was soon bestowed on them.^v St. Augustine reluctantly confesses that in his time many were “adorers of pictures.”^x Statues were not yet erected; nor was the Saviour himself represented, otherwise than in symbolical forms,^y until the next century; although the teachers of the Church, abandoning the earlier view as to the uncomeliness of his personal appearance,^z took up one of an opposite kind, and thus prepared the way for the introduction of that type on which the artists of later ages have expressed their ideal of serene majesty and tenderness.^a

The cross was adorned with gems and gold, and was perhaps set upon the altars of churches.^b Julian charged the Christians with worshipping it.^c But the crucifix, like all other representations of our Lord which are associated with sorrow and suffering, was not known until some centuries later.^d

^s The account is given by himself, in a letter, which was translated by St. Jerome (Ep. li. 9). Baronius (392. 249, seqq.) boldly maintains that this is a spurious addition to the epistle. But Dr. Newman (n. on Fleury, i. 231) says that “there seems no question” of its genuineness. See Basnage, 1327; Augusti, xii. 181.

^t Lindsay, i. 47; Ozanam, ii. 275.

^u Schröckh, i. 231–2; Gieseler, I. ii. 282–3. See Paulinus, Poema 28.

^v Gieseler, I. ii. 284. See on the whole subject Pusey, in Tertullian, i. 109–116.

^x De Morib. Eccl. Cath. i. 34.

^y For instance, as a beardless youth—“to signify the everlasting prime of

eternity” (Lindsay, i. 42). Theodore the Reader relates that a painter of Constantinople, in the patriarchate of Gennadius (A.D. 458–471), having represented the Saviour under the form of Jupiter, was punished by the withering of his hand, which was restored at the patriarch’s prayer. i. 15.

^z See p. 173.

^b Mosh. i. 347; Milman, iii. 503–8; Lindsay, i. 76–7.

^c Bingham, VIII. vi. 20; Neand. iii. 406.

^d Ap. Cyril. c. Jul. p. 194.

^e Gieseler, ii. 284; Milm. iii. 513–4. Kugler (Handbook of Italian Painting by Eastlake, ed. 2. p. 11) refers it to

(4.) During the fourth century much was done to fix those parts of the Liturgy which until then had been fluctuating.^e The name of St. Basil in the East, and that of St. Ambrose in the West, are especially celebrated in relation to this work, although both have been connected with much that is of later date.^f The hymns of Ambrose became the models for such compositions in the Western Church,^g and, from the general designation of the style as *Ambrosian*, it came to pass that many were wrongly ascribed to him.^h

The division of the service into the “mass of catechumens” and the “mass of the faithful,” was maintained, until, in the fifth century, its abolition naturally followed on the general profession of Christianity and the general practice of infant baptism.ⁱ Now that the celebration of Christian worship was not attended with danger, the earlier portion of the service—including psalmody, reading of Scriptures, prayers, and sermon—was open to Jews and heathens, as well as to catechumens and penitents.^k

(5.) At baptism some new ceremonies were introduced, as the use of lights and salt,^l and an unction with oil *before* baptism (significant of the receivers’ being “made kings and priests unto God),”^m in addition to that with chrism, which continued to be administered *after* baptism.ⁿ The previous training was methodized by a division of the catechumens into three classes,—*hearers*, *kneelers*, and *competents*,—the last being candidates who were fully prepared.^o The vigils of Easter and Pentecost were, as before, the most usual times for baptism.^p In the East, the Epiphany became popular as a baptismal season, connected as it was with the Saviour’s baptism in the Jordan,^q and the administration at Whitsuntide was disused.^r The custom of baptising on the Epiphany also made its way into Africa^s and other western coun-

the eighth century. Augusti says that Cardinal Borgia supposes a crucifix given by Leo III. (about A.D. 800) to the Vatican as the earliest known specimen; but he himself, on grounds which appear extremely vague, would carry the use of the crucifix up to very early times. xii. 119–122.

^e Bingham, VII. v.; Gieseler, I. i. 294.

^f Palmer’s *Origines Liturgicæ*, ed. 2, pp. 66–7, 125–133; Guéranger, *Instit. Liturgiques*, i. 195.

^g Schröckh, xiv. 313–5; Guéranger, i. 114.

^h Bähr, *Christl.-röm. Litteratur*, i. 37.

ⁱ It has been argued that the division continued longer, but all that can be inferred from the facts collected by

Pagi (xi. 459–462) is, that something of the kind was in some cases practised by missionaries as late as the seventh century.

^k Concil. Carthag. iv. A.D. 398, c. 84; Gieseler, I. ii. 293–4.

^l Augusti, vii. 299, 315.

^m Rev. i. 6; 1 Pet. ii. 5–9.

ⁿ Augusti, vii. 297; Bingham, XI. ix. 1–2; Gieseler, I. ii. 295.

^o Martene, i. 12; Bingham, X. ii. There were, however, differences as to the division. Augusti, xi. 50–3.

^p Martene, i. 1.

^q See p. 170.

^r Augusti, i. 334; vii. 174, seqq.; Neander, iii. 460.

^s Martene, i. 2, where other customs are given.

tries; but when some Spanish bishops baptised at Christmas, Epiphany, and on the festivals of saints, Siricius, in his decretal epistle to Himerius (A.D. 385), noted it as a presumption, and ordered that baptism should not ordinarily be given except at Easter and Whitsuntide.[†]

The practice of deferring baptism has been exemplified in many instances[‡] in the preceding chapters. The delay, however, did not arise from any opinion that the baptism of infants was unlawful (for in case of danger they were baptised, and the institution was regarded as apostolical), but from fear lest a greater guilt should be contracted by falling into sin after baptism.[§] And the time to which the sacrament was postponed was not, as with modern sectaries, that of attaining to years of discretion; but the season of serious illness or other danger, or, in the case of clergymen and monks, that of entering on a new and strict manner of life. Eminent teachers of the Church, as Gregory of Nazianzum and his namesake of Nyssa, endeavoured to counteract the custom by exposing the mistakes on which it rested.[¶] Gregory of Nyssa states that, when alarmed by earthquakes, pestilences, or other public calamities, such multitudes rushed to be baptised, that the clergy were oppressed by the labour of receiving them.[‡]

(6.) The customs of churches varied as to the frequency of celebrating the Eucharist.[§] Where there was no daily consecration, it became usual to *reserve* the consecrated bread, which thus became liable to be used for superstitious purposes; as we are told that Satyrus, a brother of St. Ambrose, was saved in a shipwreck by tying a morsel of the holy bread to his neck;[¶] and that in another case the application of such bread, by way of a poultice, opened the eyes of a blind person.[‡] When the elements were consecrated, the people partook of both; to refuse the wine was noted as a mark of Manichæan heresy.[§]

(7.) The name of *Agape* was now used in a sense different from that which it had originally borne—to designate festivals held by churches at the tombs of their martyrs, or by families at those of

[†] Siric. ad Himer. 2 (Hard. i. 847); Comp. Leo, Ep. xvi. (Patrol. liv.).

[‡] E. g. Constantine, Constantius, Valentinian I., Valens, Gratian, Valentinian II., Theodosius; Gregory of Nazianzum, Basil, Ambrose, Nectarius, Jerome.

[§] Augustin. Confess. i. 41; Schröckh, xiii. 414; Neander, iii. 452-5.

[¶] Greg. Naz. Orat. xl. 12, seqq.; Greg. Nyss. adv. eos qui differunt bap-

tisma, in vol. iii. of his works.

[‡] T. iii. p. 217.

[§] See Basil, Ep. 93; Aug. Ep. liv. 2; Augusti, viii. 150. On the doctrine of the Eucharist, see Gieseler, I. ii. 296-7.

[¶] Satyrus was at the time only a catechumen, but obtained the bread from a communicant. Ambr. de Excessu Frat. Satyri, i. 43.

[‡] Aug. Op. imperf. c. Julian. iii. 162.

[§] Leo, Sermon. xlii. 5 (Patrol. liv.).

their relatives. These festivals took the place of the heathen *Parentalia*, and were celebrated with so much of unseemliness and excess, that bishops and councils, during the latter part of the century, exerted themselves to suppress them.^e But so great a hold had these celebrations on the multitude, that the abolition of them was no easy matter, and could hardly be attempted without danger. Thus, the Third Council of Carthage, in 397, does not venture to forbid them, except “as far as possible;”^f and notices of them are found as having continued in some places until the following century.^g

(8.) The Lord's Day was observed with greater strictness than before. Constantine, as we have seen,^h ordered that no legal proceedings and no military exercises should take place on it; yet he allowed agricultural labour to be carried on, lest the benefit of favourable weather should be lost. The Council of Laodicea directed that labour on this day should be avoided as much as possible.ⁱ Theodosius, in 379, and again in 386, enacted that no civil business should then be done, and abolished the spectacles in which the heathen had found their consolation when the day was set apart from other secular uses by Constantine.^k

The custom of observing the Sabbath in a similar manner to the Lord's Day was now declining. The Laodicean canon, which has just been quoted, denounced a cessation from work on it as Judaical.^l

(9.) The Quartodeciman practice as to the observance of Easter was condemned by the Council of Nicæa, and was thenceforth regarded as a mark of heterodoxy.^m The Council, however, did not direct by what means the proper day should be determined; and hence, although Easter was everywhere kept on a Sunday, the reckonings of different churches varied sometimes to the extent of a month or more.ⁿ The science of Alexandria gave the law to

^e Conc. Laod. A.D. 372 (?), c. 28; Fleury, xx. 11. St. Augustine mentions that his mother, while at Milan, wishing to observe her African custom of carrying cakes and wine to the tombs of the martyrs, was told that St. Ambrose had forbidden it. (Confess. vi. 2.) Augustine himself was very active in endeavouring to put down the practice of eating and drinking in churches—both within his own diocese, and by urging other bishops to act in the matter. Epp. 22, 29; De Mor. Eccl. Cath. i. 34, &c.; Bindemann, ii. 336, seqq.

^f C. 30.

^g Baron. 391. 39; Bingham, XV. vii. 9; Neand. iii. 475; Gieseler, I. ii. 299–300; Milman, iii. 435, 444.

^h P. 183; Cod. Just. III. xii. 3.

ⁱ εἴ γε δύναντο, C. 29. See Bingham, XX. ii. 3.

^k Cod. Theod. VIII. viii. 3; XI. vii. 13; XV. v. 2. See the Code, t. i. 120–1.

^l C. 29. See Neander, iii. 421–2.

^m See, e. g., Conc. Laod. c. 7. Some of the eastern Novatianists, although generally orthodox, adhered to it. Soc. v. 21.

ⁿ Bingham, XX. v. 4; Neander, iii. 426–8; Guericke, i. 399; Kaye, Athan. 23–8.

the eastern churches in general; and in the sixth century the Alexandrian calculation was adopted at Rome.^o

The tendency of the age to an increase of ceremonies affected the celebration of Easter. The week before it was observed with additional solemnity. On the Thursday the Eucharist was celebrated in the evening, in special remembrance of its original institution;^p on Easter-Eve, "the great Sabbath," cities were illuminated,^q and crowds of worshippers, carrying lights, symbolical of the baptismal "enlightening," flocked to the churches, where they continued in vigil until the morning of the Resurrection. The following week was a season of rejoicing; the newly-baptised wore their white robes until the Sunday of the Octave.^r

The Epiphany now made its way into the West, where it was kept chiefly in remembrance of our Lord's manifestation to the Magi, but also with a reference to his first miracle and other manifestations.^s As the Donatists rejected the festival,^t it must have been unknown in Africa until after the date of their separation from the Church; the earliest express notice of its celebration in any western country is in 360, when Julian kept it at Vienne, shortly before avowing his apostacy.^u In like manner the observance of the Nativity passed from the West to the East. It was introduced at Antioch soon after 375, and was there kept on the 25th of December, although some churches combined it with the Epiphany.^v The idea that Christmas-Day was chosen from a wish to compensate for the heathen festivals of the season is refuted by the fact that the policy of the earlier Christians, from whom it had come down, met the festivities of the heathen by appointing not feasts, but fasts. Thus, in the West, a fast of three days, at the beginning of the year, was established in opposition to the Saturnalia.^x

The festivals of some of the most distinguished saints, such as St. Peter and St. Paul, St. John the Baptist, and St. Stephen, from having had only a local celebration, became, in the fourth century, general throughout the Church.^y

^o Smith, *Dissertat. in Bedam* (Patrol. xcv. 320-3); Gieseler, I. ii. 289-290.

^p Aug. Ep. liv. 6-9.

^q Euseb. V. C. iv. 22.

^r Bingham, XX. v. 12; Augusti, ii. 217; vii. 172.

^s Aug. Serm. ccii. 1. ^t Ib. 2.

^u P. 238; Bingham, XX. iv.; Neander, iii. 435.

^v Schröckh, x. 349-356. St. Chrysostom, in a homily on the Nativity,

preached at Antioch in 386, says that it was not yet ten years since the introduction of the festival there, t. ii. p. 355.

^x Schröckh, ix. 281, 293; Neander, iii. 441-7; Guericke, i. 401. Leo the Great says that the Nativity is to be kept, not with carnal, but with spiritual joy. Hom. xxii. 5.

^y Neander, iii. 473; Guericke, i. 409-411.

The practice of fasting, which had formerly been left in great measure to the discretion of individuals, was now settled by ecclesiastical laws.^z The Lenten fast, of thirty-six days, "a tithe of the year,"^a became general, both in the East and in the West, although with a difference as to its beginning, from the circumstance that in the East the Sabbath, as well as the Lord's Day, was excepted from the time of fasting.^b

Acts of mercy were connected with certain holy days and seasons. Thus, Constantine ordered that the emancipation of slaves should take place on Sundays. While he forbade other legal proceedings on Sunday, he excepted the emancipation of slaves, and such other acts of grace as were suitable to the character of the day.^c Easter became the chief season for emancipation.^d Theodosius, in 380, forbade the carrying on of criminal law-proceedings during Lent.^e Nine years later he issued a like prohibition of all bodily punishments during the same season;^f and, in 387, he renewed the laws of the elder and younger Valentinians, by which it was ordered that all prisoners, except those guilty of the very worst offences, should be released at Easter.^g

(10.) In the course of the century many canons were made on the subject of Penance, which was thus carried into great minuteness of detail. The regulation of penance was in the East ordinarily left to the consciences of individuals; especially after Nectarius of Constantinople, in consequence of a scandal which had occurred, abolished the office of penitentiary presbyter at Constantinople in 391. Socrates, who wrote about the year 439,^h expresses an apprehension of evil results from the abolition, and Sozomen, somewhat later, states that a deterioration of morals had ensued. In the West, the office of penitentiary does not appear to have existed;ⁱ and there the performance of formal penance came to be regarded as necessary in order to the Divine forgiveness. The ancient division of penitents into classes is not mentioned after the fifth century.^j

^z Gieseler, I. ii. 286-7; Neand. iii. 429.

^a Cassian. Coll. xxi. 25; Greg. Magn. Hom. in Evang. xvi. 5. The four days before the first Sunday were added in the West at a later time—some say by Gregory the Great, others by Gregory II. Bingham, XXI. i. 5; Augusti, x. 401.

^b Bingham, XXI., i. 4; Augusti, i. 158.

^c Cod. Theod. II. viii. 1.

^d Augusti, ii. 231.

^e Cod. Theod. IX. xxxv. 4.

^f Ib. 5.

^g Val. I. A.D. 367-8, in Cod. Th. IX. xxxviii. 3-4; Val. II. A.D. 381-4, ib. 6-8. The law of Theodosius is not in the Code. See Godefroy, t. ii. 272.

^h This is the year to which his history reaches. Clinton, ii. 471.

ⁱ Augusti thinks that it did. ix. 122.

^j Soc. v. 19; Soz. vii. 16; Hooker, VI. iv. 8, seqq.; Thomassin, II. i. 7, 12; Bingham, XVIII. iii. 12; Planck,

(11.) The honours paid to martyrs were naturally increased, as, from the cessation of persecution, the opportunities of martyrdom became very rare.^k And the influence of heathenism told most unhappily in this matter. Converts regarded the martyrs as the *heroes* of their new religion; they ascribed to them a tutelary power, and paid them honours such as those which belonged to the lesser personages of the pagan mythology.^l Nor was the Arian controversy without its effect in directing men's minds unduly towards the saints and martyrs. For, as the great object of orthodox controversialists, in the fourth century, was to vindicate the Saviour's Divinity, and thus his Manhood was comparatively little spoken of, He was now in thought removed further from mankind; a want of less exalted intercessors was felt, and a reverence for nearer objects grew up.^m From the middle of the century, it became usual to deliver panegyrical orations on the days assigned to the commemoration of martyrs. The preachers, feeling themselves bound to make the most of their subject on such occasions, ran out into glorifications of the martyrs, which, if at first intended only as rhetorical ornaments, were soon converted into matter of doctrine.ⁿ In addition to the earlier belief that the martyrs interceded for their brethren, it was now supposed that they were cognizant of wishes addressed to them. The popular heathen opinion, that the spirits of the dead continued to hover about the resting-place of their bodies, was combined with the idea that the souls of the martyrs were already in the presence of God; hence arose a practice of invoking them at their graves, and requesting their intercession for all manner of temporal, as well as spiritual benefits;^o and by degrees such addresses came to be put up irrespectively of place.^p Poetry, too, contributed to advance the movement; the invocations which heathens had addressed to their gods and muses were transferred by Christian poets to the saints.^q Other holy persons—as the worthies of Scripture and distinguished monks—were soon associated with the martyrs in the general veneration.^r The prayers which had, in earlier times, been offered up for saints and martyrs, in common with the rest of the

i. 511-5; Gieseler, I. ii. 321-6. Tillemont (x. 233) questions some part of the story as to the abolition of penitentiaries, and other Roman Catholic writers question more.

^k Schröckh, ix. 166.

^l Gieseler, I. ii. 263.

^m Milman, iii. 540.

ⁿ Schröckh, ix. 170-1-8.

^o Theodoret, t. iv. p. 605-6.

^p Schröckh, ix. 173-180, 191; Gieseler, I. ii. 266-8; Milman, iii. 542. See, for example, Gregory Nazianzen's invocations to St. Athanasius and St. Basil, Orat. xxi. 27; xliii. 72.

^q Schröckh, vii. 115; ix. 190; Gieseler, I. ii. 269. See the quotation from Damasus, above, p. 252, n. c.

^r Gieseler, I. ii. 270.

faithful departed, were retained, notwithstanding their growing inconsistency with the prevalent belief, until in the beginning of the fifth century they were abandoned as derogatory to the objects of them.^s Saints were, like the heathen gods, chosen as special patrons, not only by individuals, but by cities.^t Heathens, as Julian and Eunapius, began, not without plausible grounds, to retort on Christians the charge of worshipping dead men,^u and the Manichæans, as we have seen,^x joined in the reproach. St. Augustine strenuously repudiated it;^y he exhorted to an imitation of the saints, and endeavoured, as did also St. Chrysostom, to oppose the tendency towards an undue exaltation of them. But before his time practices nearly akin to worship of the saints had too surely made their way into the popular belief and feeling, as, indeed, Augustine is himself obliged to confess.^z

The bodies of martyrs began to be treated with special honour. Altars and chapels were built over their graves;^a their relics were transferred from the original places of burial, were broken up into fragments, of which each was supposed to possess a supernatural virtue,^b and were deposited under the altars of churches.^c There is no mention of such translations in the accounts of the churches built by Constantine; but in the reign of Constantius some bodies, supposed to be those of Apostles, were found, and were solemnly removed to Constantinople.^d We are told that remains of other Scripture saints, as far back as the prophet Samuel, and even the patriarch Joseph, were afterwards discovered; and, in order to prevent the risk of mistake as to bodies which had been lying in the earth for hundreds or thousands of

^s Gieseler, I. ii. 271.

^t Theodoret. t. iv. 593-4.

^u Julian, ap. Cyrill. l. x. p. 335; Schröckh, v. 134; ix. 167; Gieseler, I. ii. 275.

^x P. 342.

^y Ep. xvii. 5; C. Faust. xx. 21; De Civ. Dei, viii. 27; xxii. 10.

^z Aug. de Moribus Eccl. Cath. i. 34; Schröckh, vii. 267; ix. 169, 187-9; Gieseler, I. ii. 272-3.

^a Gieseler, I. ii. 264.

^b Theodoret. t. iv. p. 594.

^c Gieseler, I. ii. 265. Cæcilian, in the beginning of the century, reproved Lucilla for kissing the bone of a supposed martyr (see p. 190); yet the reverence for relics is soon after found prevailing throughout the Church. Romanists say that the objection in Lucilla's case was only directed against the paying honour

to one who had not been *recognised* as a martyr; but, although this circumstance is mentioned by Optatus as an aggravation, his words seem to be against the superstitious use of relics altogether. ("Os nescio cujus martyris, si tamen martyris, libare dicebatur; et cum præponeret calici salutari os hominis mortui, et, si martyris, sed necdum vindicati, correpta, cum confusione discessit irata," l. i. 16.) And, even if the suggested limitation were admitted, we must remember that the interval between Cæcilian and Optatus was precisely the time when the general veneration of relics was introduced; so that Optatus may unconsciously have given something of a turn to the story. See Schröckh, ix. 209.

^d Hieron. Chron. A.D. 360; Gibbon, iii. 23.

years, the saints themselves were said to have appeared in visions, and to have revealed the places of their interment.^e There was a readiness to believe that every grave of an unknown person was that of a martyr. St. Martin, it is said, by praying over a grave which had been thus honoured, called up a shade of ferocious appearance, and forced the supposed martyr to avow that he had been a robber, and had been executed for his crimes.^f

It has been already related that St. Antony disapproved of the Egyptian manner of showing reverence for saints by keeping their bodies above ground, and took measures for escaping such honours.^g St. Hilarion, the founder of monasticism in Palestine, having died in Cyprus, one of his disciples, Hesychius (who was himself afterwards canonised) stole^h his body from the grave, and carried it off to the Holy Land. A rivalry ensued between the places of the first and second interments, the Cypriots maintaining that, if the saint's body were in Palestine, his spirit remained with themselves; and miracles were said to be performed at both.ⁱ In another case, the possession of the remains of some monks, who had been slain by the Saracens, was disputed with bloodshed by the inhabitants of two neighbouring towns.^k

Relics were supposed to work miracles; they were worn as amulets, and the churches in which they were preserved were hung (although perhaps not before the next century) with models of limbs which had been restored to strength through their virtue.^l Pretended relics were imposed on the credulous, and various abuses arose. For the purpose of restraining these, Theodosius enacted, in 386, that no one should buy or sell the bodies of martyrs, or should translate them from one place to another.^m

The blessed Virgin Mary was not as yet honoured above other saints.ⁿ The Collyridians,^o a party of female devotees, who passed from Thrace into Arabia in the last years of the century, are

^e Soz. vii. 21; Marcellin. A.D. 453 (Patrol. li.), and Baron. 391. 7-14 (as to St. John Baptist); Chron. Pasch. A.D. 406 (for Samuel); Pagi, vii. 70 (as to Joseph); Gieseler, I. ii. 269. See against the erection of altars in consequence of dreams and "inanes revelationes," Conc. Carth. V. A.D. 400, c. 14.

^f Sulp. Sever. Vita Martini, 11.

^g P. 316.

^h Κλέψας, Soz. iii. 14; "furatus est," Hieron. Vita Hilar. 46.

ⁱ Hieron. 47.

^k Cass. Collat. vi. 1. See in Gregory of Tours, i. 43, the dispute between the

men of Tours and those of Poitiers for the body of St. Martin. Night interrupted the discussion, and both parties joined to guard the relics; but the Poitevins were miraculously thrown into a deep sleep, and their rivals triumphantly carried off the prize.

^l Theodoret. t. iv. p. 606. See Blunt's Vestiges.

^m Cod. Theod. IX. xvii. 7. "Distrahat" in this law seems to mean selling, although Gfrörer renders it by *zerstückeln* (to pull to pieces), ii. 763.

ⁿ Augusti, xiii. 6.

^o From *κολλυρίς*, diminutive of *κόλλω*, a cake.

noted as heretics for offering cakes to her with rites which were perhaps derived from the heathen worship of Ceres.^p But with the growing admiration of the virgin life, of which St. Mary was regarded as the type, there was a progress of feeling towards opinions which became more decided during the controversies of the following century.^q On the other hand, the perpetual virginity of the Saviour's mother was denied by the anomœan Eunomius,^r by some of the Apollinarians,^s by Helvidius,^t a Roman lawyer (A.D. 383), and Bonosus,^u bishop of Sardica (A.D. 392); and a sect of *Antidicomarianites* (adversaries of Mary)—called forth by the extravagances of the Collyridians, is mentioned as having existed in Arabia.^x

Anything like worship of angels was as yet supposed to be expressly forbidden by Scripture. St. Ambrose is the only father of this age who recommends invocation of guardian angels.^y

(12.) From the time of Helena's visit to the Holy Land, a great impulse was given to the practice of pilgrimage.^z It was supposed, not only that the view of scenes hallowed by their association with the events of Scripture would enkindle or heighten devotion, but that prayers would be especially acceptable if offered up in particular spots; and, as in the heathen system, some places were believed to be distinguished by frequent miracles.^a From all quarters—even from Britain^b—pilgrims flocked to the sacred sites of Palestine, and on their return they carried with them water from the Jordan, earth from the Redeemer's sepulchre, or chips of the true cross, which was speedily found to possess the power of reproducing itself.^c Many, it is said, were even led by their uncritical devotion to visit Arabia for the purpose of beholding the dunghill on which the patriarch Job endured his trials.^d Pilgrimage became a fashion, and soon exhibited the evil characteristics of a fashion, so that already warnings were uttered against the errors and abuses which were connected with it. The monk Hilarion,

^p Epiphan. lxxix. 1; Walch, iii. 623-634.

^q Schröckh, ix. 198; Gieseler, I. ii. 275-7.

^r Philostorg. vi. 2.

^s Epiph. lxxvii. 26.

^t Hieron. c. Helv. (t. ii.); Walch, iii. 586.

^u Ambr. de Inst. Virg. 35; Walch, iii. 598.

^x Epiph. lxxviii.

^y Conc. Laod. A.D. 372 (?), c. 35; Aug. de Civ. Dei, x. 19; Ambros. de Viduis, 9; Augusti, iii. 281-4; Gieseler, I. ii. 278; Hagenbach, i. 342.

^z Schröckh, v. 135-6, 138-142; Mil-

man, ii. 418.

^a Mosh. i. 347; Schröckh, ix. 224-5.

^b Hieron. Ep. xlv. 10; Pallad. Hist. Laus. 118.

^c Cyril of Jerusalem, although cited by Baronius (326, 50) as a witness for the multiplication of the wood, in reality speaks only of the dispersion of fragments throughout the world (Catech. iv. 10). But Paulinus, in a distant country, and half a century later, speaks of the reproduction. Ep. xxxi. 6.

^d Chrys. ad Pop. Ant. Hom. v. 1, (t. ii.).

during his residence of fifty years in Palestine, visited the holy sites but once, and for a single day—in order, as he said, that he might neither appear to despise them on account of their nearness, nor to suppose that God's grace was limited to any particular place.^e St. Gregory of Nyssa wrote a treatise for the express purpose of dissuading from pilgrimage. Among our Lord's beatitudes, he says there is none for those who shall visit Jerusalem. For women the pilgrimage must be, at the least, distracting, since they cannot perform it without male companions; and there is continual danger from the promiscuous society of the hostleries on the way. The Saviour is no longer bodily in the holy places; He and the Holy Spirit are not confined to Jerusalem. Change of place will not bring God nearer to us: wherever we are, He will come to us, if our hearts be a fit abode for Him to "dwell in and walk in;" but if the inner man be full of evil thoughts, although we were at Golgotha, on the Mount of Olives, or at the memorial of the Resurrection, we are as far from receiving Christ within us as they who have not even begun to feel Him. For himself, Gregory says that he had made the pilgrimage, not out of curiosity, but on his way to a council in Arabia, and had escaped the usual dangers by travelling in an imperial carriage, and in the company of religious brethren; yet the sight of the localities had added nothing to his belief of the Nativity, the Resurrection, or the Ascension: while the desperate wickedness of the inhabitants had proved to him that there could be no special grace in the places, and had taught him to value more highly than before the religion of his own Cappadocia. Monks (he says) ought to endeavour to pilgrim from the body to the Lord, rather than from Cappadocia to Palestine.^f Even Jerome—although he had fixed his abode in the Holy Land, and although in some of his writings he expatiates on the influence of its hallowed associations^g—yet elsewhere very earnestly warns against the delusions by which the multitude of pilgrims was led thither. "It is not matter of praise," he tells Paulinus, "to have been at Jerusalem, but to have lived religiously at Jerusalem."^h The scenes of the Crucifixion and of the Resur-

^e Hieron. Ep. lviii. 3.

^f "De iis qui adeunt Hierosolyma," Opera, ii. 1084-7. This tract has given much trouble to Romanists. Some have attempted to prove it spurious; Baronius (386. 48), while allowing its genuineness, contends that it applies only to persons who had embraced the monastic life, and is not meant to dis-

courage others from pilgrimage. But, although specially addressed to monks, it has certainly a wider scope.

^g E. g. Epp. xlvi. 4; xlvii. 2; cviii. 8, seqq.

^h This is imitated from Cicero Pro Murena, sect. 12, "Non Asiam nunquam vidisse, sed in Asia continenter vixisse laudandum est."

rection are profitable to such as bear their own cross and daily rise again with Christ—to those who show themselves worthy of so eminent a dwelling-place. But as for those who say ‘The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord’—let them hear the Apostle’s words—‘Ye are the temple of the Lord, and the Holy Spirit dwelleth in you.’ The court of heaven is open to access from Jerusalem and from Britain alike; ‘for the kingdom of God is within you.’”¹

VI. *Opposition to the Tendencies of the Age.*

The new ideas and practices which were introduced into the Church excited the mockery of the older sects—such as the Novatianists and the Manichæans—who loudly charged the Catholics with paganism.^k The teachers of the age could not but reprobate some of the novel corruptions, and attempted to counteract them. But they bore with, and even encouraged, much that eventually proved mischievous—partly from a desire to facilitate the progress of the Gospel and to deal tenderly with converts;¹ partly from a regard to the pious intention which lay under strange and injudicious manifestations, or from a want of that historical experience which would have enabled them to detect the lurking germs of evil.^m On the other hand, there were persons who decidedly opposed the tendencies of the time; but unhappily with such a mixture of error in their own opinions, and sometimes with such indiscretion in their conduct, as excited a general odium, and served to strengthen the cause which they combated. Two of these, Helvidius and Bonosus, have lately been mentioned;ⁿ the former was encountered by St. Jerome, the latter by St. Ambrose.

Aërius, a presbyter of Sebaste, in the Lesser Armenia, was of earlier date—about A.D. 360. He is described by Epiphanius as an Arian;^o but his notoriety arose from his opposition to the discipline and observances of the Church. In consequence, it is said, of having been disappointed in his aspirations to the bishoprick of Sebaste, he began to assert that bishops and presbyters were equal—an opinion which in those days was altogether novel, since almost all the sects had at their outset been careful to obtain episcopal ordination for their ministers, and even those which had departed

¹ Ep. lviii. 2–3. For cautions from Chrysostom and Augustine, see Augusti, x. 123–6, 129–131.

^k Gieseler, I. ii. 331. See above, p. 342.

¹ See Aug. Ep. xxix. 9.

^m Gieseler, I. ii. 332. See Beugnot, ii. 262–4.

ⁿ P. 355. For Helvidius, see Theiner, i. 195–8.

^o lxxv. 1.

from the usual form of polity had acknowledged the necessity of a graduated hierarchy; yet, although he denied the Divine institution of episcopacy, he appears to have admitted its lawfulness.^p He denied the utility of stated fasts, and of prayers and alms for the departed; his followers, in determined opposition to the Church, chose Sunday for their occasional fasts, while they ate freely on the fourth and sixth days of the week, and spent the penitential part of the Paschal season in feasting.^q It would seem, indeed, that Aërius altogether objected to the celebration of Easter; although some writers have supposed that his objections were directed only against the practice of eating the *paschal lamb*, which had been retained until his time in some churches, and which he regarded as a remnant of Judaism.^r

Among the western opponents of the prevailing system was Jovinian, a monk of Rome, who began to publish his opinions about A.D. 388.^s Although one of his chief tenets was a denial of the superiority usually ascribed to celibacy, he continued his monastic profession.^t He denied the perpetual virginity of the Redeemer's mother,^u and maintained that if single and married persons were equal in other respects, their conditions were also equal. He opposed the over-valuation of the act of martyrdom.^x He denied the merit of fasting, and the distinctions of food.^y He maintained, and with a strange perversion of Scripture texts, that there was no other distinction between men than the grand division of righteous and wicked; that there was no difference of grades in either class, and that there would hereafter be no difference of degree in rewards or in punishments.^z Whosoever had been

^p See Epiph. lxxv. 3; Walch, iii. 331.

^q Epiph. i. c.

^r Walch (iii. 333), Schröckh (vi. 227-9), and Neander (iii. 286-7) consider that, except on this supposition, there would be no point in the words ascribed to the heresiarch—"You give heed again to Jewish fables; for it is not right τὸ πάσχα ἐπιτελεῖν, since Christ your passover is sacrificed" (Epiph. lxxv. 3). But the meaning seems to be merely that, since the sacrifice on the cross, there is no need of a yearly celebration. And the line of argument which Epiphanius takes in defence of the *pascha* (c. 6) seems to prove that the object of Aërius' attack was nothing less than the observance of the season altogether.

^s Schröckh, ix. 233.

^t Aug. de Hæres. 72. St. Jerome styles him the "Epicurus of the Chris-

tians," charges him with having exchanged the monastic temperance for a life of luxury, and draws a ludicrous picture of his sleek, well-attired, and jovial appearance. He asks (somewhat unfairly), "If you think marriage equally good with celibacy, why do you not marry?" (Adv. Jovin. i. 1, 40.) Even St. Augustine, instead of giving Jovinian any credit on account of the celibacy which in others was held so admirable, says that he remained single for the sake of avoiding the troubles of married life. De Hæres. 72.

^u Aug. de Hæres. 72.

^x Hier. adv. Jov. i. 3.

^y Ib.; Aug. l. c. It does not, however, appear that he denied the utility of fasting as a help to religion. Walch, iii. 652.

^z Hieron. i. 3; ii. 18-20; Neand. iii. 386-9.

truly baptized had, according to Jovinian, nothing further to gain by progress in the Christian life; he had only to preserve that which was already secured to him.^a The true baptism was different from the sacrament of the Church; indeed, Jovinian altogether set aside the idea of the visible Church.^b The true baptism was a baptism of the Spirit, conferring indefectible grace; they who had it could not be overcome by the devil. If any one, after receiving the baptismal sacrament, fell into sin, it was a proof that he had never received inward baptism; and such a person might, on repentance, yet be made partaker of the true spiritual baptism.^c All sins were equal; nor was there any difference as to guilt between sins before and after baptism. With such doctrines there was naturally connected an insufficient idea as to the importance of individual sins.^d

Jovinian's opinions were favoured by the popular feeling at Rome,^e where he made numerous converts, and induced many persons of both sexes, who had before embraced the celibate life, to marry; but among the clergy he found no adherents.^f After having been condemned and excommunicated in 390, by a synod under Siricius, he repaired to Milan, in the hope of finding favour with Theodosius; but Ambrose had been warned against him by Siricius, and the Roman sentence was repeated at Milan.^g Jerome wrote against him with violent personality, and in so doing exaggerated the merits of celibacy to such a degree as to give Jovinian's cause an advantage. His friend Pammachius (who had married a daughter of Paula, and, on her death, had renounced eminent wealth and station to become a monk)^h endeavoured in vain to suppress the treatise, and, in order to take off the effects of its extravagance, Augustine wrote in a more moderate strain, a book *De Bono Conjugali*.ⁱ Nothing further is known of Jovinian. Jerome speaks of him as dead in 404; yet it has been conjectured

^a Aug. l. c.

^b Neand. iii. 389-390.

^c Hieron. i. 3; Jul. Eclan. ap. Aug. Op. Imperf. i. 98; Walch, iii. 655-6.

^d Aug. de Hæres. 72; Neand. iii. 385-6; vi. 410.

^e Jerome is very sore on this account (see above, p. 326), and it may be well to quote a specimen of his style:—"Nunc restat ut Epicurum nostrum, subantem in hortulis suis inter adolescentulos et muliereculas alloquamur. Favent tibi crassi, nitidi, dealbati. Adde, si vis, juxta Socraticam irrisiorem, omnes sues, et canes, et, quia carnem amas,

vultures quoque, aquilas, accipitres, et bubones. Quoscumque formosos, quoscumque calamistratos, quos crine composito, quos rubentibus buccis videro, de tuo armento sunt, immo inter tuos sues grunniunt. De nostro grege tristes, pallidi, sordidati, et quasi peregrini hujus sæculi, etc." ii. 36.

^f Aug. l. c.; Theiner, i. 199.

^g Siric. Ep. 7 (Patrol. xiii.); Ambr. Ep. 42.

^h Hieron. Ep. 66; Paulinus, Ep. 13.

ⁱ Hieron. Ep. xlviii., xlix. 2; Aug. Retract. ii. 22.

that he was the same who, under the name of Jovian, was charged eight years later with disturbing the Roman Church by his conventicles, and was sentenced by an edict of Honorius to be severely beaten and banished.^k

Another of Jerome's adversaries may be fitly noticed in this place, although he did not appear until somewhat later than the time embraced in the preceding chapters.

Vigilantius was the son of an innkeeper at Calagurris (Hourra, or Casères), on the French side of the Pyrenees.^l After having spent his early youth in assisting his father, he was taken into the household of Sulpicius Severus, the biographer of St. Martin, where he enjoyed the opportunity of applying himself to letters; and he was advanced to the order of presbyter. Through Sulpicius he became acquainted with Paulinus, a noble Aquitanian of Roman family, who, after having filled high secular offices—even, it is said, the consulship^m—forsook the world, was forcibly ordained a presbyter at Barcelona,ⁿ and settled at Nola, in Campania, in order that he might be near the tomb of St. Felix, a confessor of the time of Decius.^o Paulinus may be regarded as an example of the manner in which the spirit of the time acted on a religious and enthusiastic mind. He persuaded his wife, Terasia, to renounce the married estate, and lived monastically with a few companions.^p His reverence for saints was carried to an extent beyond that of his age. He devoted himself especially to St. Felix; he built a church over the tomb, and adorned it with

^k Cod. Theod. XVI. v. 3. See Tillem. x. 227-9; Walch, iii. 664; Schröckh, ix. 237; Neander, iii. 390. I can hardly think, with Theiner (i. 233), that we are justified in setting aside Jerome's statement of a fact on account of the coarse language in which it is expressed—"Inter phasides aves et carnes suiles non tam emit spiritum quam eructavit." Adv. Vigil. i.

^l Bayle, art. Vigilance, n. A.; Walch, iii. 675-7; Gieseler, I. ii. 335-6; Gilly's Vigilantius, 125, Lond. 1844. See also Baron. 406. 40, seqq.; Tillem. xii.; Mosheim, i. 468-9; Schröckh, ix. 262, seqq.; Neander, iii. 479-481; Theiner, i. 224; Milman, iii. 335-6.

^m So his friend Ausonius distinctly states in a poem (Ep. 20). But the name of Paulinus does not appear in the Fasti. It is therefore supposed that he took the place of some consul who did not complete his term of office. Tillem. xiv. 720; Muratori, in Patrol. lxi. 22, 791-4; Schröckh, vii. 124;

Clinton, ii. 467.

ⁿ Paul. Ep. i. 11 (Patrol. lxi.).

^o For Paulinus, see Tillemont, xiv.; Hist. Litt. ii. 179, seqq.; Gilly, c. iv.; Ampère, i. 271, seqq.; Ozanam, Civ. Chrét. au 5me Siècle, ii. 240, seqq.

^p Life, by Muratori, c. 18. There are two curious letters on the subject of a cook who was sent to him by Sulpicius from Gaul, in consequence of the desertion of other cooks, who regarded the simple food of the Nolan community as unworthy of their art. (Sulp. Sev. Append. Ep. 3. Patrol. xx.; Paul. Ep. 23, ib. lxi.) Paulinus replies in great delight as to the virtues and accomplishments of "brother Victor," who seasoned his meagre porridge with such salt of grace and such sweetness of charity that no want of material condiments was felt (6), and was also skilful as a barber (10). The only drawback was, that he felt scruples at receiving the ministrations of so saintly a servitor (4).

paintings, among which were scenes from the Old Testament and a symbolical representation of the Trinity.^a Every year, on the festival of the confessor, Paulinus produced a poem in celebration of his life or miracles; every year he repaired to Rome, for the feast of St. Peter and St. Paul. The example and influence of a person so distinguished by rank, and so devout in life, who was the correspondent of Jerome, Augustine, Rufinus, and others of the most eminent among his contemporaries, could not fail to advance the superstitions to which he was addicted.^r

Vigilantius, after having visited Paulinus at Nola, set out for the East, being furnished by him with a letter of introduction to Jerome, which procured for him an honourable reception from the recluse of Bethlehem.^s But disagreements soon arose. Vigilantius accused Jerome of Origenism,^t and although he retracted the charge before leaving Bethlehem, he again asserted it in his own country.^u

A.D. 396.

Some time after his return to the West, Vigilantius began to vent peculiar opinions. He assailed the prevailing excess of reverence for departed saints; he maintained that their souls, which existed "in Abraham's bosom, or in the place of rest, or under God's altar," could not be present at their tombs; he denied the possibility of their intercession after death, and the miracles which were asserted to be wrought at their graves. Miracles (he said) were beneficial to unbelievers only; by which he seems to have implied that, as the power of working them had been given for the conviction of Jews and heathens, the time in which they might be expected was past.^x He attacked the veneration of relics as idolatrous, and the lighting of candles at the tombs of saints in the daytime as a pagan superstition. He wished that all vigils except that of Easter should be abolished, and spoke of them as giving occasion for debauchery.^y He denied the usefulness of fasting, continence, and monas-

^a Ep. 32; Poëma 28. See Augusti, xi. 186.

^r Paulinus was born in 353 or 354, retired to Nola in 394, became bishop of that place in 409 (between 402 and 405, Clinton), and died in 421 or 424 (431, Pagi, vii. 411; Clinton). Tillem. xiv. 732; Mansi in Bar. vi. 430. See Le Brun, Dissert. in Paulinum (Patrol. lxi.). A story of his having sold himself for the redemption of a captive, told by St. Gregory the Great (Dial. iii. 3), is rejected by Pagi, vii. 413-6, and by Tillemont, xiv. 136.

^s Murat. Vita, 22.

^t See the next chapter.

^u Hieron. Ep. lxi.

^x Hieron. c. Vigil. 10; Walch, iii. 697-8; Schröckh, ix. 267; Neander, iii. 481. The Oxford annotator on Fleury (ii. 125) says that Vigilantius did not deny the fact of the miracles wrought at the tombs of martyrs, but only complained of the objects to which they were directed. St. Jerome's words (l. c.) seem to me clearly to intimate the contrary.

^y Hieron. 7, 9.

ticism, and regarded the profession of chastity as a source of corruption. He maintained that it was better to retain property, and to bestow of it by degrees for pious and charitable purposes, than at once to relinquish the whole; and that it was better to seek for objects of charity at home than to send money to Jerusalem.^z

Jerome, whose old animosity against Vigilantius was revived by the publication of these doctrines, attacked him with
A.D. 404-6. the most furious abuse. He reproached him with having been a tapster, and told him that he now practised the same tricks on Holy Scripture as formerly on the wine which he dispensed and on the money which he gave in change; that he opposed fasting, continence, and sobriety, because they interfered with the profits of his trade.^a The argumentative part of the pamphlet cannot be described as very happy. Jerome partly denies the existence of the superstitions which Vigilantius had censured—or, at least, that they existed as anything more than popular usages, unsanctioned by the Church; and, by way of overwhelming his opponent, he asks how he can presume to question practices which had been countenanced by emperors and bishops.^b

In justice to Vigilantius, it ought to be remembered that our only knowledge of his opinions comes from a very violent and unscrupulous adversary. They would seem to have been produced by a reaction from the system in which he had been for a time engaged—the system exemplified in his patron Sulpicius, in Paulinus, and more coarsely in Jerome. It is a circumstance greatly in his favour that, to the vexation of his opponents, his own bishop countenanced him, and that he found other supporters in the episcopal order;^c and, although we may hesitate to acquit him of error, there can be little doubt that it is an abuse of language to brand him with the title of heretic.

Nothing is known of the later history of Vigilantius. His doctrines—urged probably with a blameable vehemence and confidence—were so much opposed to the current of the time, that they did not require a council to condemn them; and they were soon obliterated by the Vandal invasion, to which it has been conjectured that their author himself may have fallen a victim.^d

^z Hieron. 13-4.

^a C. Vigil. 1, 13; Epp. 61, 109.

^b Adv. Vigil. 5, 7, 9.

^c Hieron. Ep. cix. 2; Bayle, note C.; Schröckh, ix. 268; Theiner, i. 227-230.

^d Baron. 406. 51-2; Gilly, 472-9. Dr. Gilly supposes the opinions of Vigilantius to have been the seed of those which are found among the Waldenses, &c., at a later time.

At the end of a period so full of controversy as the fourth century, I may advert to an objection which has often been brought against preceding writers, and to which I cannot but feel that my own work is liable, in common with theirs. It is said that Church history, as it is usually written, is only a record of quarrels; and wishes are expressed for a history which should more fully display the fruits of the Gospel for good. On some such principle Milner wrote; but, if the required book were possible, it cannot be said that Milner has superseded the need of further labours in the same line. I believe, however, that the plausible objection in question is founded on a misconception. Church history must follow the analogy of secular history. As the one deals in detail with wrongs and calamities, with wars, with intrigues, with factions, but must pass over with mere general words the blessings of prosperity, and must leave utterly unnoticed the happiness which is enjoyed not only under good governments, but even notwithstanding the very worst; so the other must dwell on the sad story of errors and contentions, and must allow the better side to remain untold. It is not the "peace on earth," but the "sword" that must be its theme. History takes cognisance of men only as they affect other men; of things, only as they differ from the every-day course. In Church history, even saints appear too commonly in their least favourable aspect. The occasions which bring them forward are often such as to draw forth their defects rather than their excellences. Their better part, in so far as it *can* be written, belongs mainly not to history, but to biography; nay, even of noted and illustrious saints, the highest graces are not matter even for biography; they cannot be written on earth. And the great and immeasurable blessings of the Gospel do not consist in the production here and there of a conspicuous hero of the faith, but in its effect on the vast unrecorded multitudes whom it has guided in life, whom it has comforted in trouble, whose death it has filled with the hope of immortality. Unrecorded as these things have been, we yet cannot doubt of their reality, but are assured that the same benefits which we witness in our own day and in our own sphere must in all times have flowed from the same enduring source. Instead, therefore, of requiring from a historian of the Church that which is foreign to the nature of his task, we must read with the remembrance that the better portion of Christian history is to be supplied by our own thoughts—thoughts grounded on a belief

in the Divine assurances, and confirmed by such opportunities as we may have enjoyed of witnessing their fulfilment.

NOTE ON MIRACLES.

A writer of Church History is perhaps bound to notice the question as to the alleged miracles of the ages which followed that of the Apostles. In the preceding chapters, I have sometimes, with more or less of diffidence, given an opinion on individual miracles which have been mentioned; sometimes—and more especially where it seemed superfluous to express my disbelief—I have related them without any comment. But I feel myself so little qualified for discussing the general subject that I have not ventured to introduce it into the text.

On the subject of miracles, there is a remarkable inconsistency in the statements of writers belonging to the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth centuries. Origen, a hundred and fifty years earlier, while maintaining the continuance of miraculous powers in the Church, had described the miracles of his own time as less than those of the Apostolic age, and seems to limit them to the cure of diseases;* and now St. Chrysostom speaks of it as a notorious and long-settled fact that miracles had ceased.^f Yet at that very time, St. Martin, St. Ambrose, and the monks of Egypt and the East are said to have been in full thaumaturgical activity; and Sozomen (viii. 5) tells a story of a change of the eucharistic bread into a stone as having happened at Constantinople, while Chrysostom himself was bishop. So again, St. Augustine says that miracles such as those of Scripture were no longer done; yet he immediately goes on to reckon up a number of miracles which had lately taken place, apparently without exciting much sensation, and among them *seventy* formally attested cures, wrought in his own city of Hippo, within two years, by the relics of St. Stephen.^g

Among late writers on the ecclesiastical miracles may be named Dr. Newman, who has at different times maintained both sides of the question—the negative, in an essay contributed to the ‘*Encyclopædia Metropolitana*’ (about 1830), and the positive, in a dissertation prefixed to the Oxford translation of Fleury (1842); Mr. Isaac Taylor, in the 7th part of his book entitled ‘*Ancient Christianity*’ (1841); Mr. Henry Rogers, in an article which appeared in the ‘*Edinburgh Review*’ for October, 1844, and has since been reprinted in the second volume of his *Essays*; and the late learned Bishop Kaye, who, in the third edition of his work on Tertullian, made some remarks on Dr. Newman’s second essay. Dean Trench has also touched, although slightly, on the subject of this note, in his valuable work on the Gospel Miracles.^h

Dr. Newman’s later essay is affected by the peculiar position which the author held at the time when it was composed—as a member of the English Church, but far advanced towards the Romanism which he professed three

* See C. Cels. i. 2; i. 46; ii. 9; iii. xxxiv.–ix.; Milman, iii. 252–3; Rogers, ii. 210.

^f Newman, in Fleury, xxxix.

^g De Civit. Dei, XXII. viii. 1, 20. See Newman in Encyc. Metrop., Church Hist. i. 393 (12mo. ed.); and in Fleury,

^h I may also refer to Prof. Löbell’s observations on the miracles of the sixth century (Gregor von Tours, 290–300).

years afterwards. And perhaps he has nowhere more strongly displayed his extraordinary ingenuity—a quality which, when carried to excess, may even hinder the efficiency of a controversialist, by suggesting the suspicion that the writer who displays such fertility of resource on one side of a question, might possibly be able to argue still better on the other side.

With the exception of the section on Julian's attempt to rebuild the temple,¹ Dr. Newman's defence of particular miracles appears to me less plausible than his general argument. That argument is conducted on the principle of meeting the objections to ecclesiastical things by endeavouring to show that Scripture is liable to similar objections—a very dangerous system, which Dr. Newman himself has elsewhere described as a “kill or cure remedy,”^k and which is here carried out by labouring to establish an undistinguishable confusion between Scripture and legend.^l

On the whole, while I would not deny that miracles may have been wrought after the times of the Apostles and their associates,^m I can find very little satisfaction in the particular instances which are given. Among the most obvious objections are the following:—

That the miracles of the third and fourth centuries are different in character from those of the first: and that the difference does not consist in a less display of the wonderful, but in a lowering of tone. (This Dr. Newman allows; but he answers, that, as in nature some animals are noble and beautiful, while others are ridiculous, hideous, or disgusting, so a like diversity may be expected in God's *extraordinary* works!)ⁿ

That, unlike the miracles of Scripture, they are said to be done prodigally, and that we cannot see a sufficient object for them, as we generally can, more or less clearly, for the Scriptural miracles.

That in proportion as they are further from the apostolic age, they are not (as might have been expected of true miracles) the less common, but the more so.

That, whereas Scripture miracles were intended to lead to purification and enlightenment of belief, those of the fourth century are alleged in favour of manifest superstitions and corruptions, which were then growing on the Church.^o

That much must in reason be deducted from the stories, on the ground of credulity, exaggeration, and even of loose principles of veracity, which we know to have been sanctioned under the name of “economy,” by the fathers of the age.^p

That similar stories are found among heathens, the later Jews, and the enthusiasts of more recent times.^q

The late accounts of magnetic phenomena appear to be also an important element in the matter. Many of the ecclesiastical miracles find parallels in

ⁱ Since this was written I have found that Mr. Rogers (ii. 215) is inclined to make the same exception to his general disbelief of the ecclesiastical miracles.

^k Tracts for the Times, No. lxxxv. p. 3.

^l See Rogers, ii. 206.

^m Prof. Blunt, in his Lectures on the Early Fathers (published since the first edition of this volume), confines his view to the second and third centuries, and thinks that miracles were then

done, although he expresses himself with caution. Ser. ii. Lect. 6.

ⁿ Essay in Fleury, xlvii. seqq.

^o Schröckh, vi. 300, viii. 296.

^p See above, p. 271; Hey's Lectures, I. xii. 15–6; Gieseler, I. ii. 307; Rogers, ii. 210. Sulp. Severus says that St. Martin's miracles were more known and believed in distant countries than in his own. Dial. i. 26.

^q Newman, in Encyc. Metrop. 369.

the modern stories of electro-biology, clairvoyance, and Mesmeric cures. If these cases are truly reported, and are referred to the true causes, they suggest an agency by which the corresponding ecclesiastical miracles *may* have been effected (and it must be remembered that the consciousness of magnetic power is by no means regarded as necessary for the exercise of it). If the reporters are mistaken—and in many of them there can be no suspicion of wilful untruth—their stories have a bearing on the value of the testimony for the ecclesiastical miracles. When, for example, we find an experienced man of science publishing such narratives as those contained in Dr. William Gregory's "Letters on Animal Magnetism"—if the Edinburgh professor of our own time has been deceived, what amount of erroneous testimony might we not expect from the unscientific, zealous, and uncritical writers of the fourth and fifth centuries?

CHAPTER VII.

ARCADIUS AND HONORIUS.—ORIGENISTIC CONTROVERSY.—
ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM.

I. THEODOSIUS left two sons,—Arcadius, aged eighteen, and Honorius, who was only eleven years of age; the elder succeeded to the sovereignty of the East, the younger to that of the West, and after this division the Empire was never again united.^a The reigns of these imbecile princes were full of calamity. Themselves incapable of governing, each of them was subject to a succession of too powerful ministers and generals.^b Of these, Stilicho alone, the general of Honorius, possessed the qualities which were requisite for the support of the Empire. In 403 he defeated Alaric the Goth, at Pollentia, in Liguria; but five years later, at the very time when his abilities were most urgently needed to meet a renewal of the Gothic invasion, he fell a victim to the arts of a rival, Olympius.^c Rome was thrice besieged by the Goths. The first siege was raised by the payment of a large ransom; the second resulted in Alaric's setting up a puppet, Attalus, as emperor; in the third, the city was taken and sacked.^d Throughout this period we read of revolts in various provinces, of insurrections of the Barbarians who had been admitted within the Roman territory, and of invasions by fresh hordes from the countries beyond. These invasions fell more especially on the western division of the Empire. In 404, Honorius, finding himself exposed to the Goths at Milan, removed to Ravenna, which for the next three centuries continued, throughout all the changes of government, to be regarded as the capital of Italy.^e

In 408, Arcadius was succeeded by his son Theodosius II., a child seven years of age. The young prince was at first under the guardianship of Anthemius, and, from 414, under that of his sister Pulcheria, who, for nearly forty years, held the virtual sovereignty of the East.^f Honorius reigned till 423.^g

^a Gibbon, iii. 30.^b Eunapius, ed. Bonn. p. 86.^c Gibbon, iii. 63, 91-2.^d Gibbon, iii. 120-132.^e Gibbon, iii. 72; Schröckh, vii. 24.^f Soz. ix. 1.^g Gibbon, iii. 204.

The weakness of the government, the irruptions of the Barbarians, and the changes in the administration prevented the adoption of any sustained and uniform policy for the suppression of paganism.^h Both in the East and in the West laws were repeatedly issued for the abolition of sacrifices,ⁱ and for the confiscation of such allowances and endowments as had hitherto been left to the heathen priesthood; but the necessity of frequent re-enactment shows, no less than the occasional relaxations of these laws, that they were very imperfectly executed. It is a significant circumstance that heavy penalties are often threatened against magistrates who should neglect to enforce them;^k as if the government knew that there were many among its local officers from whom in such a cause it could not expect any willing service.^l In 408, under the administration of Olympius, Honorius published a law, by which all but the professors of orthodox Christianity were excluded from employment about the court.^m But it is said that Generid, commander of the troops at Rome, one of the barbarian chiefs on whose arms the degenerate Romans then depended, indignantly cast away the ensigns of his command, refused any exemption which should not extend to other heathens, and terrified the emperor into a hasty repeal of the enactment.ⁿ In the East, however, similar laws were passed both by Arcadius and by the younger Theodosius.^o

Towards the end of the fourth century a tale was current among the pagans that St. Peter had, by magical arts, discovered that Christianity was to last for 365 years, and was then to perish.^p The period was completed in 398,^q and the hopes of the heathen party had risen high; but they were disappointed. Other disappointments followed. The barbarian leader, Radagaisus, who, as being himself a heathen, had engaged their sympathies, was overthrown by Stilicho. When Alaric first laid siege to Rome, the pagan members of the Senate ascribed the calamities of the empire to the neglect of the rites by which

^h Schröckh, vii. 227; Neander, iii. 111-2. Just. I. iv. 20; v. 12.

ⁱ Cod. Theod. XVI. x. 13, seqq.

^k E. g. ib. 19; Cod. Just. I. xi. 7 (A.D. 451).

^l Beugnot, ii. 18, 52.

^m Cod. Theod. XVI. v. 42.

ⁿ The story rests on the suspicious authority of Zosimus (v. 46), but is generally admitted.

^o Cod. Theod. XVI. v. 29, 48; XVI. x. 21. Comp. Laws of Justin I., Cod.

^p Aug. de Civ. Dei, xviii. 53-4. Gieseler refers this to a misunderstanding of Christian ideas as to the second advent, and the "acceptable year of the Lord." I. ii. 37.

^q Tillem. Emp. v. 511; Neander, iii. 114; Beugnot, ii. 9. Pagi (vi. 263) and Schröckh (vii. 240) make the period 369 years, but, by reckoning from an earlier date, bring the end to the same year.

their fathers had obtained the favour of the gods, and had raised their country to its height of glory. It is said that some Tuscan soothsayers, who professed to have saved Narni from the invader by drawing down lightnings for his discomfiture, undertook to deliver Rome in the same manner through the use of incantations and sacrifices. Even the bishop, Innocent, is stated by a heathen writer to have consented to the experiment, provided that it were made in secrecy, "preferring the safety of the city to his own opinion." The Tuscans, however, insisted, as an essential condition, that the rites should be performed with all form and publicity, in the name of the state and with the attendance of the senate; and, as the senators refused to give this kind of sanction to idolatry, the soothsayers were dismissed.^r This tale has probably no other foundation than that the pagans wished to take advantage of the public danger in order to attempt a restoration of their religion. Attalus, although baptised into Arianism, courted them by re-establishing the ancient rites; but their joy was soon checked by his deposition.^s

The barbarian irruptions were, in truth, greatly injurious to paganism. There was no instance of barbarians embracing the old religion of Greece or Rome; they either adhered to the superstitions of their own ancestors, or adopted some form of Christianity.^t Alaric and his Goths, who were Arians, directed their wrath against heathen temples even more zealously than the Christians of the Empire. It is from Alaric's invasion of Greece that the suppression of the Eleusinian mys-^{A.D. 396.}teries is dated.^u In the capture of Rome temples were attacked, while churches were revered and those who sought a refuge in them were spared; and some, at least, of the Gothic soldiers manifested in their behaviour towards the defenceless some influence of the religion which they professed.^x The Christians saw the vengeance of God in the calamities which fell on Rome; they had a story that Alaric, while on his march, was entreated by a holy monk to spare the city, and answered that he did not go of his own will, but that One was continually urging him forward to take it.^y The pagans, on their side, referred all the miseries of

^r This version of the story comes from Zosimus, v. 41. Sozomen (ix. 6) intimates that the rites were performed, and failed. See Mosheim, i. 419; Gibbon, iii. 122; Schröckh, vii. 242-3; Gieseler, I. ii. 36; Beugnot, ii. 55-7; Milman, iii. 181; Lat. Christ. i. 99.

^s Beugnot, ii. 61-3.

^t Gieseler, I. ii. 38; Beugnot, ii. 143.

^u Gibbon, iii. 57.

^x Aug. de Civ. Dei, i. 2, 4; Soz. ix. 10; Gibbon, iii. 133-4; Milman, Lat. Christ. i. 101-5.

^y Soc. vii. 10; Soz. ix. 6.

the time to Christianity—a theory which St. Augustine combated in many sermons, and in refutation of which he undertook his great work “Of the City of God,” written between the years 412 and 426. With the same view, Orosius, a Spaniard, at Augustine’s desire, drew up, about 417, a compendium of universal history, in which he argued that earlier ages had been as calamitous as his own, and had been the more wretched in so far as they were without the remedy of true religion.^z

Paganism yet lingered long.^a In the East, Theodosius, in a law of A.D. 423, affects to question whether it still had any adherents; but the doubt is refuted by clear evidence of facts.^b The chief strength of the old religion, however, lay in the West. In some districts its spirit was still so powerful that Christians who attempted to execute the laws against temples and idols were killed by the exasperated heathens.^c In many places where the religion of the Gospel was professed, the old tutelary gods still held their position;^d and besides the great infusion of pagan spirit into the Christianity of the time, many purely heathen ideas and usages were still retained among Christians.^e The conformity of proselytes was often merely outward; for, as the adherents of the old religion were not generally disposed either to suffer for its sake, or to forego the advantages which were connected with a profession of the new, many of them submitted to be baptised, and afterwards, when occasion served, again declared themselves pagans. Hence arose the necessity of those frequent enactments against apostasy which would appear unaccountable if the apostates had ever been really Christians.^f

Africa was a chief stronghold of paganism, and the distractions of the Donatistic schism told in its favour.^g St. Augustine advised a gentle mode of dealing with the worshippers of idols as most likely to be effectual. “First,” he says, “we endeavour to break the idols in their hearts. When they themselves become Christians, they will either invite us to the good work of destroying

^z Oros. Hist. Præf. l. i. 1 (Patrol. xxxi.); Galland, ib. col. 659.

^a See Ozanam, Civ. Chrét. au 5me Siècle, leçon 4.

^b Cod. Theod. XVI. x. 22. In 425 he repeats the expression of doubt both as to Paganism and as to Judaism. (Ib. XV. v. 5.) See Gibbon, iii. 22; Schröckh, vii. 233; Neander, iii. 117; Gieseler, I. ii. 33. M. de Beugnot (ii. 195) supposes that only a fourth part of the inhabitants of Constantinople were Christians. But his calculation

seems extremely loose.

^c Aug. Epp. 50, 91; Baron. 399. 72; 400. 4; 401. 53, &c.; Gieseler, I. ii. 35; Beugnot, ii. 145.

^d Beugnot, ii. 148, seqq.

^e Ib. 103; Gieseler, I. ii. 40–1.

^f Beugnot, ii. 69, 98–100; Neander, iii. 117–8; Gieseler, I. ii. 31–2. There were eight laws against apostasy between 381 and 426. Cod. Theod. XVI. vii. Cf. Cod. Just. I. xi. 10.

^g Beugnot, ii. 155–6. See the next chapter.

their idols, or anticipate us in it. Meanwhile we must pray for them, not be angry with them.”^h He complains that Christians took part in heathen ceremonies and rejoicings. A council held at Carthage, in 399, solicited the emperor to suppress certain banquets, which were among the principal means of keeping up the old religion; and also to order the destruction of all remains of idolatry, together with the temples which were in rural places.ⁱ The government was not prepared for such measures; in the same year it was directed that the public rejoicings should be celebrated, although without sacrifices or superstition, and that such of the temples as contained no unlawful things should be left uninjured;^k but nine years later the banquets were forbidden, and the bishops were authorised to suppress all monuments of idolatry.^l

The old Roman aristocracy, which had clung to the religion of its forefathers more from pride than from conviction, was scattered by the taking of Rome. Many of its members emigrated to their possessions in Africa, Egypt, or elsewhere, and the pagan interest suffered in consequence.^m But in the rural parts of Italy—notwithstanding a law of the year 408, by which landlords were ordered to destroy temples on their estatesⁿ—the ancient worship subsisted, until at a later time it was followed into its retreats and extirpated by the labour of the monks.^o

Such of the temples as were not ornamental in their architecture were demolished. It was ordered that those in cities or suburbs should be applied to public uses; many were shut up, and remained vacant until the Christians took possession of them and converted them into churches.^p

The abolition of the gladiatorial shows at Rome, against which Christian teachers had long inveighed and pleaded in vain,^q is referred to the reign of Honorius. When the emperor, after the victory of Pollentia, was celebrating a triumph with games of this kind, Telemachus, an Oriental monk, who had made a journey to Rome for the purpose of protesting against them, leaped into the arena, and attempted to separate the combatants. The spectators, enraged at this interference with their amusement, stoned him to

^h Serm. lxii. 11 (t. v.). Comp. Beugnot, ii. 7.

ⁱ Cod. Canon. Eccl. Afric. 58, 60 (Hard. i. 898).

^k Cod. Theod. XVI. x. 17-8.

^l Cod. Theod. XVI. x. 19 (A.D. 408).

^m Tillem. Emp. v. 597; Gibbon, iii. 138; Beugnot, ii. 112; Milman, iii.

181.

ⁿ Cod. Theod. XVI. x. 19. See Godefroy's notes.

^o Neander, iii. 113; Milman, iii. 183.

^p See Cod. Theod. XVI. x. 13, 19; Schröckh, vii. 228-9; Beugnot, ii. 139-141; Milman, iii. 182.

^q Ozanam, i. 161.

death. The emperor acknowledged that such a death deserved the honours of martyrdom, and, with the willing acquiescence of his people, whose fury had soon given way to repentance, he abolished the inhuman spectacles.^r

II. The disputes as to the opinions of Origen, which had begun during his lifetime, continued after his death. The martyr Pamphilus, in conjunction with Eusebius of Cæsarea, wrote a defence of him.^s In the great controversy of the fourth century, his name was frequently mentioned, and the tendency of his doctrines was much disputed; for, while the Arians wished to claim his authority, and some of their extreme opponents, such as Marcellus of Ancyra, styled him the father of Arianism, his orthodoxy was maintained by St. Athanasius and other champions of the Catholic faith.^t So long as Arianism and its varieties engrossed all attention, the opinions of Origen on other subjects did not come into question. His writings exercised an important influence among the teachers of the eastern Church; but, although these were in general content to draw instruction from him, without regarding him as faultless, there were two extreme parties, the one of which rejected him as a heretic, while the other was unreservedly devoted to him.^u Pachomius warned his monks against Origen as the most dangerous of seducers, whose doctrines would conduct the reader to perdition;^v but the monks of Nitria found in his works provision for their mystic and spiritualising turn of mind.^x

In the West, Origen was only known by name, but the general impression was unfriendly to him.^y Jerome attempted to introduce him more favourably, by translating some parts of his writings and embodying them in commentaries on the Scriptures. In a letter written during his residence at Rome, he speaks with enthusiastic praise of the "indefatigable"^z Alexandrian, and says that

^r Theodoret, v. 26. The story of Telemachus has been questioned. Gibbon expresses a "wish to believe" it (iii. 70). Beugnot allows its truth, but says that the gladiatorial shows continued until the Roman manners were superseded by the Gothic (ii. 24-5). Dean Milman, in answer to some remarks of Müller (De Genio, etc. Ævi Theodosiani), observes that "Müller has produced no evidence or allusion to gladiatorial shows after this period. The combats with wild beasts certainly lasted till the fall of the Western Empire; but the gladiatorial combats

ceased, either by common consent, or by imperial edict." N. on Gibbon, iii. 71.

^s See Origen, vol. iv. pt. 2; the note on Jerome, ii. 403; Walch, vii. 412-424.

^t Walch, vii. 429; Neand. iv. 447-8. See above, p. 108.

^u Schröckh, x. 102.

^v Vita Pachom. 27 (Patrol. lxxiii.).

^x Hieron. c. Rufin. iii. 22.

^y Aug. Ep. xl. 9; Tillem. xii. 110; Schröckh, xii. 42; Neand. iv. 447-8, 457.

^z "Adamantius."

he had been condemned at Rome, "not for the novelty of his doctrines, not for heresy, as mad dogs now pretend against him, but because his enemies were unable to endure the glory of his eloquence and learning."^a After his final retirement to Bethlehem, Jerome renewed an acquaintance of earlier days with Rufinus, a native of the diocese of Aquileia. Rufinus had lived eight years in Egypt,^b where he visited the monks, studied under the blind Didymus, and suffered in the persecution of Valens.^c He had now settled on the Mount of Olives in company with Melania, a noble and pious Roman widow, and had been ordained presbyter by John, bishop of Jerusalem.^d Jerome became very intimate with him, and celebrated his virtues in terms which are even extravagant;^e and the friends agreed in admiration of Origen.^f

In the year 393 a pilgrim from the West, named Aterbius, arrived at Jerusalem, where, as he had been accustomed to hear the name of Origen connected with disrepute, he was astonished at finding that it was held in high honour. In a frantic manner, according to Jerome, he charged Rufinus with Origenism, and, knowing the intimacy which existed between the two, he included Jerome in the accusation.^g Jerome, keenly sensitive as to his reputation for orthodoxy, disavowed the imputation with great eagerness, saying that he had read Origen only in the same way as he had read the works of heretics.^h Rufinus refused to have any communication with his accuser, and confined himself to his own house until Aterbius had left Jerusalem.ⁱ

Soon after this affair, Jerusalem was visited by Epiphanius, bishop of Constantia (formerly Salamis), and metropolitan of Cyprus. Epiphanius had been educated as A.D. 394. a monk, and was then more than eighty years of age.^k He was

^a Ep. xxxiii. Other passages of Jerome in celebration of Origen are collected by Rufinus, Apol. ii. 13-18, 22.

^b Apol. ii. 12.

^c He alludes to his sufferings, Hist. Eccl. ii. 4; Apol. ad Anast. 2. Jerome, of course, mocks at the idea of his having been a confessor. (Adv. Ruf. ii. 3; iii. 26.) See the Life of Rufinus by Fontanini, Patrol. xxi. 80.

^d See Pallad. Hist. Laus. 118-9, where it is said that no man was to be found of greater learning or meekness than Rufinus. The lamentations of Baronius (393. 25-6), that a lady of Melania's eminence, who had buried her husband and two sons "siccis penitus oculis" (see Hieron. Ep. xxxix. 4), should

fall under the influence of an Origenist, are curious.

^e See Ep. iv. 2 (which, however, is of earlier date).

^f Tillem. xii. 161-2; Schröckh, xii. 109-110.

^g Hier. c. Ruf. iii. 33.

^h This is in his letter to Vigilantius, who brought a similar charge against him in 394 or 395. Ep. lxi. See above, p. 361.

ⁱ Hier. c. Ruf. iii. 33; Tillem. xii. 161-2; Schröckh, x. 135-6.

^k His birth is placed about 310 by Tillemont (x. 487); between 310 and 320 by Schröckh (x. 4); but Dupin places it as late as 332 (iii. 295).

a man of vast reading, which extended to the Greek, Syriac, Hebrew, Egyptian, and Latin languages, and he enjoyed an extraordinary popular fame for sanctity, so that miracles and prophecies were ascribed to him;¹ but both his conduct and his remaining works prove him to have been injudicious, weak, narrow-minded, and obstinate.^m In his work on Heresies, he had spoken very strongly against Origen,ⁿ whom his character and his education alike unfitted him to appreciate; and he was connected by friendship with Jerome, who had spent some time with him in Cyprus while on his way from Rome to the East.^o

Epiphanius, on his arrival at Jerusalem, accepted the hospitality of the bishop, John, and behaved with courtesy to Rufinus. The Origenistic question had not been mentioned between him and his host, when Epiphanius, in preaching at the church of the Resurrection, broke out into a violent invective against Origenists, which was evidently intended to reflect on the bishop. Jerome reproaches John with having indecently expressed his impatience by looks and gestures, and states that he sent his archdeacon to beg that the preacher would not pursue the subject. As the two bishops proceeded to the church of the Cross, where another service was to be held, it was difficult to make way through the multitudes who crowded around Epiphanius, kissing his feet, touching the hem of his garment, and holding out children to receive his blessing. These displays of reverence, it is said, excited the envy of John. He preached in the church against Anthropomorphism, apparently with an intention of charging Epiphanius with that error, which was not uncommon among the extreme opponents of Origen. The old man, when it came to his turn to speak, declared that he approved all which had been said by John; that he condemned Anthropomorphism; and in return he required that John should anathematize Origenism.^p The dispute thus commenced became

¹ Hier. c. Ruf. ii. 22; Schröckh, x. 8-12.

^m It is but justice to mention a story which shows that St. Epiphanius was not a slave to the monastic peculiarities. Hilarion, a short time before his death, was on a visit to the bishop. Some fowls were served up at table, and Epiphanius asked his guest to partake of them. Hilarion excused himself, saying that, since he put on the habit of a monk, he had never eaten of any animal. "And I," said Epiphanius, "since I put on the same habit, have never allowed that any one should lie down to sleep with a grievance against me on his

mind, even as I have never gone to rest at variance with any one." "Father," replied the monk, "your rule is more excellent than mine." Vitæ Patrum, ed. Rosweyd, v. 15 (Patrol. lxxiii.). Casian tells a similar story of two monks (De Cœn. Inst. v. 27). A monk of later date, Gunther, on being urged by St. Stephen, king of Hungary, to eat of a roast peacock, prayed with tears that he might be delivered from the temptation to break his vow; whereupon the bird came to life and flew away. Schröckh, xxi. 543.

ⁿ Hier. 64. ^o Hier. c. Ruf. iii. 22.

^p Hier. c. Joh. Hierosol. 11.

more and more vehement. Epiphanius, in high displeasure on account of a sermon which John had preached, left Jerusalem and repaired to Bethlehem. He afterwards wrote to Jerome's monks, charging them to break off communion with their bishop; and, when in the diocese of Eleutheropolis, he forcibly ordained Paulinian, brother of Jerome, to the offices of deacon and presbyter, for the purpose of ministering to the monks of Bethlehem.^q John protested against this invasion of his episcopal rights, and a fierce controversy followed, which involved questions of doctrine, discipline, and personal conduct. The errors attributed to Origen were classed under eight heads. He was charged with heretical views on the relations of the Divine Persons; with strange and unsound opinions as to the pre-existence of souls, the salvation of the devil and evil spirits, the resurrection of the dead, the condition of man before and after the fall; and with singular allegorical misinterpretations of Scripture, extending even to the denial of its literal truth.^r Jerome attacked Rufinus and John with all his acrimony. He complained that the bishop did not fairly meet him; that he only attempted to answer three out of the eight charges, and that, instead of discussing the question of doctrine, he dwelt continually on the irregularity of Paulinian's ordination.^s It was in vain that Archelaus, Count of Palestine, and Theophilus, Bishop of Alexandria, attempted to interpose as mediators; but at length, as Rufinus was about to leave the Holy Land, in 397, he and Jerome were solemnly reconciled at the altar of the Church of the Resurrection.^t

The quarrel, however, was soon revived. Rufinus removed to Rome, where a friend, who was engaged on a work against astrology, inquired of him what were Origen's A.D. 398. opinions on that subject—being himself unacquainted with Greek.^u On this Rufinus translated the Apology of Pamphilus, and Origen's own treatise *De Principiis* (Περί Ἀρχῶν), the most questionable and suspected of all his writings. The translation (by which alone the greater part of the book is now known) was made on an extraordinary principle. As Origen had himself complained that his works were falsified, Rufinus assumed that the suspicious passages were the interpolations of heretics, and altered them so that

^q Hier. Epp. li. lxxxii. (The former is a translation of a letter from Epiphanius to John.) Tillem. xii. 165, 169, 170. Paulinian's mouth was stopped at each ordination, lest he should adjure the bishop in the name of Christ to desist. See above, p. 310.

^r Epiph. ap. Hieron. Ep. li. 4-5; Hier. c. Joh. Hieros. 7.

^s Ep. lxxxii.

^t Hieron. c. Ruf. iii. 33; Vita Hieron. cc. 28-9; Vita Ruf. i. 3-4; Tillem. xii. 172-200; Schröckh, x. 142, 150-7.

^u Rufin. Apol. i. 11.

they might accord with his own views of orthodoxy, and with other passages of the author's writings. Against the correctness of the presumption as to falsification, it is observed that Pamphilus and Eusebius had not used any such plea in their defence of Origen;^x nor was it justifiable by such means to reduce Origen to consistency with himself, inasmuch as he not only may have varied in opinion during his long life, but is known to have held that the difference between exoteric and esoteric teaching would warrant a difference of statement. After having avowedly subjected the text to his violent editorial process, Rufinus rather strangely adjured readers and copyists, in the name of God and by the thought of the resurrection and of eternal fire, to make no omission, addition, or change of any kind in the reformed *De Principiis*.^y

Jerome, whose old fondness for Origen had been invidiously mentioned by Rufinus in his preface, was urged to exhibit the Alexandrian in his true character by means of a more faithful translation. He complied,^z and in a letter to Pammachius and Oceanus, who had suggested the task, he earnestly disclaimed the suspicion of Origenism. "I praised" (he says) "the interpreter, not the dogmatic teacher; his genius, not his faith; the philosopher, not the apostle. . . . If you believe me, I never was an Origenist; if you do not believe me, I have now ceased to be one."^a The question now was, not whether certain opinions were sound, but whether Origen had held them, and whether his admirers continued to hold them, notwithstanding all protestations to the contrary.^b Finding that, although his explanations were satisfactory to Siricius and other Italian bishops, his position at Rome was rendered intolerable through the influence of Jerome, Rufinus retired to Aquileia, bearing with him a letter of recommendation from Siricius, who died shortly after (Nov. 26, 398).^c The next bishop of Rome, Anastasius, was solicited to take up the subject by Theophilus of Alexandria, who had now declared him-

^x Hier. Ep. lxxxiv. 10-1. Schröckh thinks, however, that Jerome may have gone too far in denying any interpolation. x. 163-4.

^y Præfat. ap. Hier. Ep. lxxx.; Origen, i. 45. He defends his principle of translation, Apol. ii. 46-7.

^z Epp. lxxxiii. - v., cxxiv.; c. Ruf. i. 6. Rufinus lays hold of the inconsistency of this with Jerome's words to Vigilantius at an earlier time:—"That by his means the Latins possessed the good of Origen, and knew

nothing of his evil." (Hier. Ep. lxi. 2; Ruf. Apol. i. 21.) Jerome replies sharply, by asking whether Rufinus considered himself one of the LXX., so that no man might translate after him. C. Ruf. iii. 36.

^a Ep. lxxxiv. 2-3. Cf. Ruf. Apol. ii. 19.

^b Schröckh, x. 193.

^c Hieron. Ep. cxxvii. 9-10; Baron. 397. 28-33; Pagi, vi. 236. Baronius is troubled by the Pope's favour for the Origenist.

self against Origenism; while at home he was stimulated by the importunities of Marcella and others (chiefly pious and noble ladies), who were under the direction of Jerome.^d He summoned Rufinus to Rome; and, on his alleging that family reasons detained him at Aquileia,^e condemned Origen and the translations from his works—declaring that, until these appeared, he had neither known who Origen was nor what he had written. He also speaks of an imperial order (of which nothing is otherwise known) against reading the Alexandrian's writings.^f Jerome and Rufinus carried on a war of angry apologies and counter-apologies, in which their old familiarity was remembered only as affording the means of reproaching each other with the sayings and the actions of former days. Augustine was so distressed by witnessing such a dispute between men of advanced age and of reputation for learning and piety—ancient friends, too, and fellow-students of Scripture,—that, in writing to Jerome himself, and on the supposition that *his* representations were correct, he could only express his sorrow at the unseemly spectacle.^g Jerome in one of his tracts assumes a tone of seeming moderation and gentleness. He entreats Rufinus to let the matter drop; if (he says) they had ^{A.D. 401.} erred in youth, they should be wiser in age, and should rejoice in each other's improvement; but, with an inconsistency not unusual in controversialists who advise moderation, he insists that the difference shall be ended on his own terms—by his opponent's joining in abjuration of Origen.^h

Rufinus appears to have been at length weary of the contest, and ceased to write. He was driven from Aquileia by the troubles of Italy, and once more set out with Melania for the Holy Land, but died by the way in Sicily—having seen along the ^{A.D. 410.} opposite coast the fires of the devastation by Alaric's army.ⁱ Jerome after his death spoke of him by the name of *Grunnius* (the Grunter);^k and in his Preface to Ezekiel he thus alludes to the event: "The Scorpion is buried under the soil of Sicily, with Enceladus and Porphyryon; the many-headed hydra has ceased to hiss against us."^l

^d Hieron. Epp. lxxviii.; cxxvii. 10.

^e Ruf. Apol. ad Anast. 1.

^f Anast. Ep. 1. ad Joh. Hieros. (Patrol. xx.). It has been said that Anastasius excommunicated Rufinus; but this letter is inconsistent with the idea. See Fontanini's Life, ii. 19 (Patrol. xxi.).

^g Aug. Ep. lxxiii. 6-8.

^h Adv. Ruf. iii. 9.

ⁱ Pagi, vi. 596; Fontanini, Patrol. xxi. 291.

^k Comment. in Jerem. Prolog. (t. iv. 681); in c. xxii. 24 (ib. 817).

^l T. v. 16-7.

III. In another quarter the Origenistic controversy involved the fate of one of the most eminent men who adorned the ancient Church.

John, who for his eloquence has received the name of Chrysostom or *Golden-mouthed*,^m was born at Antioch about the year 347. While very young he lost his father, a military officer of rank, and was left to the care of a pious and truly admirable mother, Anthusa.ⁿ He became a pupil of Libanius, but was preserved, by an unintermitted study of the Scriptures, from the dangers to which the faith of Christian youths was exposed in the schools of the pagan rhetoricians; and so strongly was his master impressed by his talents, that on being asked, many years after, to name a successor for his chair, he answered that John would be the worthiest, if the Christians had not stolen him. At the age of twenty Chrysostom began to practise at the bar; but his conscience took offence at the arts which were common among the advocates of Antioch, and he resolved to devote himself to a religious life.^o He now received baptism from Meletius; and, as Anthusa's earnest and pathetic entreaties restrained him from rushing at once

A.D. 367— into monastic retirement,^p he was ordained a reader, and 370. continued to reside with her, in the practice of a strict asceticism, until her death, after which he withdrew to the mountains near Antioch.^q Here he spent four years in a monastery, and had lived for two years as a hermit in a cave, when sickness, brought on by his austerities, compelled him to return to the city.^r He was ordained deacon in 381, and, while a member of that order, he wrote his celebrated dialogue "On the Priesthood," which, notwithstanding all the difference of circumstances, still retains a high value and popularity as a manual of pastoral duty. In 386 Flavian ordained him presbyter, and appointed him chief preacher of Antioch. In this office, his eloquence excited immense admiration.^s Sometimes his sermons were carefully prepared; at other times they were altogether extemporal; sometimes he combined the two methods,—departing from his intended plan so as

^m Apparently not until after his death. (Tillem. xi. 37; Gieseler, I. ii. 86.) But it is convenient to follow the usual practice of giving him the name by anticipation.

ⁿ Palladius, Dial. de Vita S. Joh. Chrys. ap. Chrys. t. xiii. 16.

^o Soc. vi. 3; Soz. viii. 2.

^p See Chrys. de Sacerdotio, 1; Villemain, Eloquence Chrétienne, 156-7.

^q Soc. vi. 3; Soz. viii. 2; Neander's

Chrysostomus (Berlin, 1848), i. 25.

^r Pallad. 17; Soc. vi. 3.

^s Tillemont (xi. 34) understands Chrysostom to say that he sometimes had 100,000 hearers at once (Hom. 85 in Matth. t. ii. 503, ed. Field). But, as Schröckh (x. 318) points out, the meaning is that such was the number of Christians in Antioch who at one time or other heard him.

to take advantage, with admirable skill and readiness, of any topic which the moment suggested. His diction is clear and flowing, his illustrations are copious, varied, and apposite, he is distinguished by good sense, and by a knowledge of the heart, learnt rather from his own inward experience than through intercourse with others.^t In his expository discourses, which extend over the greater part of the New Testament, with some books of the Old, he adheres to the literal sense of Scripture, and never loses sight of a practical application. Among the most celebrated of his homilies are those "On the Statues," delivered on occasion of the sedition in which the statues of Theodosius and his family were thrown down at Antioch.^u While the inhabitants were in trembling expectation of some fearful punishment, and while the aged Flavian was absent on a mission of intercession to the emperor, Chrysostom daily preached in a tone of solemn and awakening eloquence. The pulpit triumphed over the theatres and the circus, to which the people of Antioch were usually devoted; and the preacher endeavoured to make the terror and excitement of the time become the foundation of a lasting reform.^x

When Chrysostom had been nearly twelve years preacher at Antioch, the see of Constantinople fell vacant by the death of Nectarius, in September, 397.^y The possession of so eminent a dignity excited much ambition; candidates resorted to discreditable intrigues and solicitations, and party spirit ran high. At length the emperor was requested to put an end to the confusion by nominating a bishop; and his choice was directed to Chrysostom through the influence of the eunuch Eutropius, who, on a late journey in Syria, had listened with admiration to the great orator's eloquence. Perhaps the minister may have reckoned on benefiting his own reputation by so laudable an exercise of his patronage; perhaps, too, he may have hoped to secure the bishop's subservience by establishing a hold on his gratitude. As there was reason to apprehend that the people of Antioch might break out into tumult if their preacher were openly taken away from them, Chrysostom was decoyed by the Count of the East to a place without the city, and thence was privately sent off to Constantinople.^z

In order that his appointment might have all the advantage of solemnity, a council was summoned on the occasion. Theo-

^t Neander, Chrys. i. 27, 35, 49.

^u See p. 273.

Chrét. 164.

^y Tillem. xi. 108.

^z Chrys. ad Pop. Antioch (t. ii.); Baron. 388. 4, seqq.; Villemain, Eloq. xi. 110.

philus, of Alexandria, on being required to take the chief part in the consecration of the new bishop, hesitated, from jealousy of the precedence lately assigned to Constantinople over his own see, and from a wish that the vacancy should be filled with one of the Alexandrian clergy ; for it is said that his skill in physiognomy warned him at the first interview that he must not expect to find a tool in Chrysostom.^a Eutropius, however, frightened him into compliance, by producing a schedule of charges against him, and threatening to bring him to trial for his misdemeanors ; and Chrysostom was consecrated on the 26th of February, 398.^b

The eloquence which had won for him the admiration of Antioch was no less effective at Constantinople. The multitudes of the capital flocked to hear him, and were zealous for his cause in his after trials ; and among the well-disposed of the higher classes (especially among pious ladies), his influence soon became very powerful.^c Much of his attention was engaged by the Arian heresy, which, notwithstanding the severity of the penal laws, continued to lurk among the Greeks, while it was the professed creed of the Gothic barbarians, who were now numerous and formidable at Constantinople. With a view of converting these to orthodoxy, he ordained clergy of their own race, gave up one of the churches for a service in their native language, and himself often preached there, his words being rendered into Gothic by an interpreter.^d When Gainas the Goth, who was at the time predominant at Constantinople, demanded a church for the exercise of Arian worship, Chrysostom alone dared to meet him with a firm denial at a conference in the emperor's presence, and obliged Arcadius to refuse ; and by conduct so strikingly contrasting with that of the pusillanimous court he won the respect of the barbarian himself.^e While thus zealous for the suppression of error within his own sphere, the archbishop also laboured for the propagation of the Gospel by sending missions to the unconverted Goths and Scythians ;^f and by obtaining an imperial warrant for the destruction of the temples in Phœnicia, which was executed at the expense of his female friends, he contributed to the extirpation of the ancient idolatry.^g

^a Pallad. 18.

^b Soc. vi. 3 ; Soz. viii. 2.

^c Soz. viii. 5 ; Tillem. xi. 112-3.

^d Theod. v. 30 ; Neand. Chrys. ii. 61-2.

^e Soc. vi. 5, 8 ; Soz. viii. 4, 8 ; Theod. v. 32.

^f Theod. v. 30. Massmann gives

curious account of a community which existed in the Crimea down to the eighteenth century, and which he derives from those Goths to whom Chrysostom's missionaries were sent. Ulfilas, Einleit. 25-8.

■ Cod. Theod. XVI. x. 16 ; Theod., v. 29 ; Neand. Chrys. ii. 68.

His influence was beneficially exerted to heal the schism of his native city. On the death of Paulinus, who had been acknowledged as bishop of Antioch by Egypt and the ^{A.D. 388.} West, his party consecrated Evagrius; but this bishop did not long survive, and they were again left without a head. Through the intervention of Chrysostom, in the first year of his episcopate, both Innocent of Rome and Theophilus were persuaded to acknowledge Flavian, who thereupon inserted the names of both Paulinus and Evagrius in the diptychs of his Church. Thus the later separation—that which Lucifer had occasioned by consecrating Paulinus^b—was brought to an end, although some remains of the old Eustathian party continued to exist without any bishop. The schism was eventually terminated by the conciliatory measures of Alexander, bishop of Antioch, in 415.¹

But as Chrysostom's new position was more conspicuous than that which he had formerly held, it also exposed him to dangers from which he had until now been exempt. Although he possessed in very large measure such a knowledge of the heart as fitted him to be a wise practical teacher of religion, he was wanting in that acquaintance with the world, and in that understanding of individual character, which are necessary for the administration of important office, and nowhere more than in ecclesiastical office.^k His temper was naturally warm; and the opposition which he met with in his endeavours at reform provoked him to expressions of anger, which both raised up enemies and supplied them with weapons against him.¹

Reform was indeed very necessary. Nectarius, having grown old in the habits of secular rank, did not greatly alter them after his sudden promotion to the episcopate; and under him the clergy of Constantinople in general fell into a style of easy living, while some of them were even scandalous in their conduct.^m Chrysostom sold the rich carpets and handsome furniture which had belonged to his predecessor; he even sold some of the marbles and other ornaments of the churches, in order to obtain funds for the establishment of hospitals and for other charitable purposes; he expended the whole of his own income on such objects, and was

^b P. 247.

¹ Innoc. Epp. 19-23 (Patrol. xx.); Soc. vi. 13; Soz. viii. 3; Theod. v. 23; Walch, iv. 478, 483. Tillemont (x. 540, 650) supposes that some Eustathians remained till 482, when the relics of Eustathius were removed to Antioch.

Against this, see Walch, iv. 486-8.

^k Schröckh, x. 452; Gibbon, iii. 187.

¹ That his irritability is exaggerated by Socrates (vi. 3), see Neander, Chrys. ii. 15-6.

^m Neander, Chrys. ii. 6-7.

indebted for maintenance to a pious widow, Olympias. Partly from a distaste for general society, and partly from feeble health, he always took his meals alone—neither giving nor accepting hospitality; and to those who wished to engage him in idle conversation, he plainly intimated that it was tedious to him. The contrast between such a way of life and that of the former bishop was naturally noted to his disadvantage, and became the ground for charges of pride, moroseness, and parsimony.ⁿ The bishops who visited Constantinople no longer found the episcopal palace open to them; for Chrysostom thought this unnecessary, since there were so many of the faithful among whom he supposed that they might be sure to find a welcome.^o Acacius of Berrhœa,^p in Syria, was so provoked by the insufficiency of the accommodations which had been provided for him on a visit to the capital, that he is said to have exclaimed, “I will season his pot for him!”^q

Chrysostom attempted to introduce an improvement among his clergy by enforcing simplicity of life and rousing them to activity in their calling.^r He deposed some of them on charges of murder and adultery, and interfered with the practice of entertaining “spiritual sisters.”^s The institution of services at night, for the benefit of persons unable to attend those of the day, gave deep offence to some clergymen, whose ease was infringed on by the imposition of additional duties.^t It would appear that, in the manner of his dealings with his clerical brethren, the bishop was too much influenced by his archdeacon Serapion, a proud, violent, and unpopular man, who is reported to have told him that the only way of managing them was “to drive them all with one stick.”^u Among the monks, too, there were many who regarded the archbishop with an unkindly feeling; for he made it no secret that in proportion to his love for the monastic life was his indignation against the strolling and greedy pretenders who disgraced it; and he excited much wrath, both among the monks and among the clergy, by advising Olympias not to bestow her bounty indiscriminately.^v

ⁿ Pallad. 19, 40, 66, 72; Soc. vi. 4; Soz. viii. 9.

^o Pallad. 42; Tillem. xi. 123.

^p Now Aleppo.

^q Pallad. 20. For Acacius, see Tillemont, xiv. 219, seqq. Although his character seems very equivocal, he possessed great reputation and influence. He had been instrumental in procuring the acknowledgment of Flavian by the western bishops, and will be mentioned hereafter in connexion with the Nestorian controversy. He must have been

already about eighty years of age, as he is said to have been a hundred and ten at the time of the Council of Ephesus (A.D. 431), and is supposed to have died at the age of a hundred and sixteen in 436.

^r Pallad. 19.

^s Pallad. 18; Soc. vi. 4.

^t Pallad. 19.

^u Soc. vi. 4; Soz. viii. 9.

^v Soz. viii. 9; Neand. Chrys. ii. 15, 20–2.

While his popularity as a preacher excited envy, his eloquence sometimes hurried him into the use of expressions which were liable to misconstruction. Thus he was reported to have said in a sermon, "If thou sin and repent a thousand times, come hither." There can be no doubt that the intended meaning of the words was innocent (if indeed they were used at all); but Sisinnius, the Novatianist bishop—who with the severe notions of his sect as to penance somewhat incongruously combined the reputation of a wit and a handsome style of dress and living—took occasion from them to write a book against him.^x Chrysostom also raised enmity by the unsparing manner in which he attacked the prevailing vices—extending his rebukes even to the court. The rapacity which the empress Eudoxia exercised in order to support her eunuchs provoked him not only to remonstrances in private, but to public censures.^y

Eutropius was disappointed in his hope of a subservient bishop, and had frequent disputes with Chrysostom. The victims of the favourite's extortions often took refuge in churches, and he procured from the feeble emperor a law abolishing the privilege of sanctuary. But, soon after, Eutropius himself was suddenly overthrown; he fled in terror to the cathedral, A.D. 399. and embraced the altar. Chrysostom withstood the soldiers who were sent to seize the fallen minister; and on the following day, when the church was crowded by a multitude of people, such as was usually assembled only at Easter,^z he discoursed on the instability of human greatness. While Eutropius lay crouching under the holy table, the bishop reminded him of his former opposition to the very privilege from which he was then seeking his safety, and entreated the congregation to intercede for him both with the emperor and with God. This address—evidently intended to disarm the anger of the hearers by exhibiting the abject condition of Eutropius^a—was misrepresented as an exultation over his calamity; and at the same time offence was taken on account of the protection which Chrysostom had afforded to the eunuch. The archbishop was even arrested, and carried before the emperor; but he fearlessly asserted the right of the Church to shelter the wretched; and it was acknowledged, although Eutropius, by leaving the sanctuary, again exposed himself to his enemies, and was put to death.^b

^x Socrates, vi. 4 (who is a vehement admirer of Sisinnius, and gives some very poor specimens of his wit).

^y Neander, Chrys. ii. 17, 114-6.

^z Chrys. Hom. in Eutrop. c. 3 (t. iii. 381, seqq.).

^a Ib. 2-3.

^b Chrys. Hom. de capto Eutrop. 1

In the last days of the year 400, Chrysostom set out for Ephesus. Antoninus, bishop of that city, had been accused of selling ordination to bishopricks, and of other offences. He died before the charges could be satisfactorily examined, and the Ephesian clergy requested the intervention of the patriarch of Constantinople. Six bishops were convicted of having bought their office from Antoninus, and were deposed. Chrysostom ordained a new bishop for Ephesus, and on his way homewards he deposed several unworthy bishops, and transferred some churches from sectaries to the Catholics.^c Some of these acts were afterwards brought against him, as having been done in excess of his jurisdiction; and in the mean time, Severian, bishop of Gabala in Syria, a celebrated preacher, whom he had left in charge of his flock, had been busily endeavouring to supplant him. Chrysostom, on being informed of this by the archdeacon Serapion, with whom Severian had quarrelled, forbade him to preach in Constantinople. Severian withdrew from the city, but was recalled by the empress, who effected a reconciliation between him and the archbishop.^d

But the desire of vengeance rankled in Severian's breast, and there were many others whom Chrysostom had offended—clergy, monks, courtiers, wealthy ladies, and even the empress herself. Acacius of Berrhœa, and Antiochus, another Syrian bishop, made common cause with Severian. They endeavoured, by inquiries at Antioch, to find some ground of accusation in the archbishop's earlier life; and, although in this their malice was disappointed,^e they soon found an unexpected opportunity of gratifying it.

Theophilus succeeded Timothy at Alexandria in 385, and held the see until 412. He was able, bold, crafty, unscrupulous, corrupt, rapacious, and domineering.^f In the first controversy between Jerome and Rufinus, he had acted the creditable part of a mediator.^g His own inclinations were undoubtedly in favour of Origen; he had even deposed a bishop named Paul for his hostility to that teacher;^h but he now found it expedient to adopt a different line of conduct.

It has been already mentioned, that, while the monks of Nitria were admirers of Origen, others among the Egyptian recluses held him in detestation. The latter class very generally fell into the

(t. iii. 386); Soc. vi. 5; Soz. viii. 7; Gothofred. n. in Cod. Theod. IX. xl. 7.

^c Pallad. 50–6; Soz. viii. 6.

^d Chrys. t. iii. 411–4; Soc. vi. 11; Soz. viii. 10.

^e Pallad. 20.

^f Tillem. xi. 452–5; Walch, vii. 555; Schröckh, x. 195–8.

^g Hieron. Ep. lxxxii.

^h Id. c. Ruf. iii. 17; Schröckh, x. 200–1.

error of anthropomorphism.¹ Thus it is related of Serapion, an aged monk of great reputation for holiness, that, when he had with much difficulty been brought to understand the falsehood of this opinion, and while the friends who had argued with him were engaged in thanksgiving for the result, he suddenly cried out, in distress at missing the image which he had been accustomed to place before his mind in prayer—"Woe is me! You have robbed me of my God, and I know not whom to worship!"^k As it was the custom of the Alexandrian bishops, in issuing the annual letters by which the time of Easter was fixed, to annex some pastoral instructions on other subjects, Theophilus, in his paschal letter of 399, took the opportunity of denouncing anthropomorphism. On this the monks who held the doctrine exclaimed against the archbishop as a blasphemer, and a party of them rushed to Alexandria, with the intention, as was supposed, of killing him. But when Theophilus saluted them with the words—"I behold you as if it were the face of God,"^l they were pacified by his seeming agreement with their notions; at their desire he condemned Origen, and from that time he used the fanaticism of these monks, and the odium attached to the name of Origen, as instruments of his designs.^m

Among the most eminent of the Nitrian monks were four brothers, known as the *Long* or *Tall Brothers*—Dioscorus, Ammonius (the same whose determined refusal of a bishoprick has been noticed in the preceding chapter),ⁿ Eusebius, and Euthymius. Theophilus conceived a high regard for these brothers; he compelled Dioscorus to accept the bishoprick of Hermopolis, the diocese in which the Nitrian mountain was situated, and, having drawn Eusebius and Euthymius from their solitude, he employed them in the financial business of his church. But, while thus engaged, they made discoveries which greatly shocked them as to the means by which Theophilus obtained funds to gratify his passion for church-building; whereupon, fearing to endanger their souls by becoming his accomplices, they left Alexandria under pretext of a wish to return to their monastic life. Theophilus soon learnt that this was not their principal motive, and resolved that they should feel his vengeance.^o About the same time, Isidore, master of a hospital at Alexandria,^p who had been ordained presbyter by

¹ Ascribing to the Deity ■ human form.

^k Cassian. Collat. x. 3.

^l Gen. xxxiii. 10.

^m Cass. l. c. 2; Soc. vi. 7; Soz. viii. 11.

ⁿ P. 330.

^o Pallad. 21; Soc. vi. 7.

^p It is not certain whether this was the same Isidore who at an earlier time had been the confidant of Theophilus,

Athanasius, and was now eighty years of age, incurred his enmity by opposing him in some intended iniquities as to money. Theophilus charged the old man with abominable offences, of which he professed to have received information eighteen years before, although the paper had been accidentally mislaid; and Isidore, knowing his persecutor's unrelenting character, sought a refuge in Nitria.^q The archbishop excited the anthropomorphite monks against the objects of his hatred, by representing these as Origenists; he procured from an Alexandrian synod a condemnation of them for Origenism and magic; he denounced the Nitrians to the governor of Egypt as insubordinate, invaded their solitude with soldiers and hostile monks, and committed great outrages—burning cells, destroying the books and other things which were found in them, and even killing some persons.^r About three hundred monks were driven from their retreat. Dioscorus was violently dragged from his episcopal throne by Ethiopians.^s The Long Brothers disavowed the opinions imputed to them, saying, like Rufinus, that these had been foisted by heretics into Origen's works. With more than eighty companions they fled into Palestine; and having been dislodged thence through the interest of Theophilus, they, with about fifty others, sought a refuge at Constantinople. Chrysostom, having ascertained from some Alexandrian clergy who were then in the capital that they were men of good repute, provided them with a lodging in the buildings of the Anastasia, and wrote in their behalf to Theophilus; but, although he allowed them to join in the prayers of the Church, he did not admit them to the eucharist, lest the archbishop of Alexandria should be offended.^t

The delicacy of this behaviour was fruitless. It was reported at Alexandria that Chrysostom had admitted the Brothers to full communion; and Theophilus, animated not only by the Alexandrian jealousy of Constantinople, but by personal dislike of the man whom he had unwillingly consecrated to the see of the "New Rome,"^u angrily answered his letter by desiring him to respect the fifth Nicene canon, which ordered that all causes should be terminated in the province where they arose. He also sent some monks to accuse the refugees before the emperor. Chrysostom had earnestly dissuaded the Brothers from carrying their complaints to

and whom he had wished to promote to the see of Constantinople, in opposition to Chrysostom. Tillem. xi. 444-5; Schröckh, x. 203; Neander, Chrys. ii. 130.

^q Pallad. 20-2; Soz. viii. 12.

^r Pallad. 22-3.

^s Ib. 23.

^t Ib. 23-4; Soc. vi. 9; Soz. viii. 13.

^u Pallad. 63-6.

the court; but on hearing of the step which their persecutor had taken, they addressed the empress in a church, praying her to grant an inquiry before a council into certain charges against Theophilus. Eudoxia consented; Theophilus was summoned, and, as he delayed his appearance, his emissaries were examined by a prefect, and were condemned as false accusers to imprisonment, in which some of them died before their employer's arrival.^x

In the meanwhile Theophilus circulated a monstrous set of propositions, which he ascribed to Origen, and actively endeavoured to enlist supporters.^y Jerome gladly lent his aid: he overwhelmed Theophilus with praises, and translated into Latin three of his paschal letters against Origen, with other documents relating to the controversy.^z Some years before, Theophilus had stigmatized Epiphanius as a heretic and schismatic, on account of the anthropomorphism which was imputed to him, and of his proceedings in the Holy Land;^a but he now applied to him, begging that he would join in the movement, and would write to Constantinople and elsewhere for the purpose of obtaining a general condemnation of Origenism.^b Epiphanius on this held a synod of Cypriot bishops, condemned the reading of Origen's works, and wrote to desire that Chrysostom would do the like;^c and, as Chrysostom took no step in the matter, the old man himself proceeded to Constantinople. Immediately after landing, he ordained a deacon, in defiance of the archbishop's rights. He refused the offers of honour and hospitality which Chrysostom pressed on him, and protested that he would hold no communication with him unless Origen were condemned and the Long Brothers were expelled. Chrysostom answered that he left both Origen and the Brothers to the judgment of the council which had been summoned. Epiphanius then endeavoured, although with very little success, to obtain a declaration against Origen from the bishops who happened to be at Constantinople. An interview with the Brothers, however, appears to have convinced him that the cause of his Egyptian ally was not altogether pure; without waiting for the expected synod, he embarked for Cyprus, and either on the voyage or soon after reaching home, he died at the age of nearly a hundred years.^d

Theophilus at length set out for Constantinople. Although

^x Pallad. 25-6; Soc. vi. 9; Soz. viii. 12.

^y Hieron. Ep. 92; Tillem. x. 461, xii. 187; Schröckh, x. 209-211.

^z Epp. 86, 88, 96, 98-100.

^a Pallad. 60; Fontanini, Vita Rufini, Patrol. xxi. 102.

^b The letter is No. 90 among Jerome's Epistles.

^c Soc. vi. 10; Baron. 399. 47.

^d Soc. vi. 12, 14; Soz. viii. 14-5;

Pagi, vi. 389; Tillem. xi. 189-193.

summoned as a defendant, and expected to appear alone,^e he was attended by a train of Egyptian bishops, and had so assured himself of support that he declared his business to be the deposition of Chrysostom. He entered the city with great pomp, and took up his abode at a suburban palace of the emperor's, where he remained for three weeks, refusing all communication with Chrysostom, and strengthening his interest by bribery, hospitalities, solicitations, and such other means as were likely to be effectual with persons of influence.^f Arcadius, who was probably not in the secret of Eudoxia's policy, desired Chrysostom to proceed to a trial; but the archbishop declined, on the ground that offences committed in another province did not belong to his jurisdiction.^g

Theophilus, when he had matured his plans, summoned Chrysostom to appear before a synod at the Oak, a villa near Chalcedon, on the opposite side of the Bosphorus to Constantinople. The president of this synod was the bishop of Heraclea, who, as metropolitan of the province within which the new dignity of Constantinople had been erected, was naturally disposed to lend himself to the humiliation of its occupant. A long list of charges, mostly false or grossly exaggerated, and concocted by Theophilus with the help of two deacons who had been deposed for serious crimes,^h was produced against Chrysostom. They related to faults in the administration of his church and its funds; to his conduct towards the clergy, in depriving some, severely reproofing others, and the like; to his private habits of life; to ritual irregularities; to doctrines which he had vented, and expressions which he had used, in his sermons:ⁱ but, although Origenism was the pretext for the Alexandrian bishop's whole proceeding, he did not venture to include it in the indictment.^k Chrysostom had with him forty

^e Chrys. Ep. ad Innocent. t. iii. 516.

^f Pallad. 26.

^g Chrys. ad Innoc. t. iii. 516. This scruple seems not to have been applicable to the case. Tillem. xi. 195; Schröckh, x. 230.

^h Pallad. 26.

ⁱ Soc. vi. 15; Hard. i. 1038-41; Neand. Chrys. ii. 152-160. Among other things, he was charged with having styled the empress *Jezebel* (Pallad. 30). The justice of this accusation may perhaps be measured by the fact that a preacher of our own day, having so designated the Church of Rome (with a reference to Revelat. ii. 20), was long pertinaciously accused of applying the name to our Gracious Sovereign. Zosi-

mus (whose account of the affair from the pagan point of view is curious) represents Chrysostom as a mob-leader, and says that he was always attacking the empress in his sermons, v. 23-4.

^k That Theophilus was not actuated by any real abhorrence of Origenism appears from his earlier conduct; from his reconciliation with the survivors of the Long Brothers when he had gained his object in the fall of Chrysostom (Soc. vi. 15; Soz. viii. 17); and from his having, some years later, forced episcopal consecration on the philosopher Synesius, notwithstanding that, among other hindrances, he avowed opinions which varied from those of the Church in the same direction as Origen's, but

bishops—a larger assemblage than the synod of his opponents, and more fairly composed, inasmuch as of the thirty-six bishops who met at the Oak all but seven belonged to the Egyptian province.¹ He earnestly besought his partizans to avoid a rupture, even although it were necessary that he himself should be sacrificed for the sake of peace. Two bishops from the hostile synod entered the assembly, and in an insolent manner summoned Chrysostom to appear at the Oak. The bishops who surrounded him answered that Theophilus ought rather to come and take his trial before themselves; but Chrysostom professed himself ready to meet all accusations before the irregular tribunal, provided that his declared enemies, Theophilus, Acacius, Antiochus, and Severian, were not allowed to sit as judges. The citation was repeated a second and a third time, but he continued to disregard it. After many hours had been spent in these fruitless communications, the bishops at the Oak received a message from the court urging them to pronounce a decision; whereupon they condemned Chrysostom as contumacious, and added that he was also guilty of treason, but that, as that offence was beyond their jurisdiction, they left the punishment of it to the emperor. Arcadius did not proceed to the extent which this malicious sentence suggested, but contented himself with condemning the archbishop to deposition and banishment.^m

Chrysostom held himself bound not to abandon his post, unless compelled by force. He was anxiously guarded by his people for three days, until, hearing that the emperor intended to seize him, and dreading some serious tumult, he surrendered himself, and was immediately sent across the Bosphorus.ⁿ The people, on learning that he was in custody, beset the palace with cries for their bishop, and in the course of the following night the city was shaken by an earthquake. The empress, alarmed both by the danger of an insurrection and by supernatural terrors, hastily despatched a messenger to Chrysostom, with a letter, in which she assured him that she was guiltless of his banishment, and desired him to return. In the meantime the agitation at Constantinople was extreme. The entrance of Theophilus into the city became the signal for such affrays between the populace and his Alexandrian sailors,

perhaps to a greater extent—as to the pre-existence of souls, the imperishableness of the world, and a denial of the resurrection of the body. Synes. Ep. 105, ed. Petav. Paris, 1652; Baron. 410. 77, with Pagi's notes; Tillem. xii.

516-521.

¹ Pallad. 27. See note in Fleury, ii. 36.

^m Chrys. ad Innoc. Ep. 1; Pallad. 27-30; Soz. viii. 17.

ⁿ Soc. vi. 15; Soz. viii. 18.

that he thought it well to retire; and Severian, who ventured to preach against Chrysostom, was forcibly driven out.^o

The archbishop's return was hailed with enthusiasm. The Bosphorus was covered with vessels of all sizes, which were crowded by multitudes eager to welcome him. It had been his intention to remain without the city until his deposition should be annulled by a council greater than that which had condemned him; but the excitement of the people, and a fear lest it should be turned against the emperor, induced him to proceed to the cathedral, where, yielding to the cries of the congregation, he took his seat on the throne, and delivered an extemporal address, in which the invasion of his church by the bishop of Alexandria was paralleled with the seizure and the forced restoration of Abraham's wife by the Egyptian King.^p Theophilus forthwith set out for Alexandria, covering his discomfiture by the pretence that his flock could no longer endure his absence.^q

Before two months had passed, Chrysostom gave his enemies a fresh pretext for attacking him. A silver statue of the empress was erected near the cathedral, and was inaugurated with the unruly and somewhat heathenish rejoicings which were usual on such occasions. The archbishop—after (it is said) having sent remonstrances to the Court, which were intercepted by the way—expressed in a sermon his strong condemnation of the scenes which were taking place almost at the doors of his church, and his words were repeated, probably with malicious exaggeration, so that the empress was violently offended.^r The offence was increased

by a sermon preached on the Beheading of St. John the

Aug. 29. Baptist, which is said to have opened with the words, "Again Herodias rages; again Herodias is agitated; again she requires the head of John." It is incredible that Chrysostom could have meant to point these words at the empress; it is doubtful whether he used them at all; but his enemies either invented or misapplied them, and hopefully resumed their intrigues.^s Theophilus did not again venture to go to Constantinople, but from his own city directed the proceedings of Severian and his other allies.^t

At Christmas, 403, Arcadius announced to the archbishop that he could not communicate with him until he had cleared himself of

^o Chrys. post reditum, 4 (t. iii. 430); Soc. iii. 19; Soz. viii. 18; Neand. Chrys. ii. 165–172.

^p Chrys. t. iii. 427; Pallad. 30; Soz. viii. 18.

^q Soc. vi. 15.

^r Soc. vi. 18; Tillem. xi. 215–6.

^s Soc. vi. 18; Soz. viii. 20. The extant sermon which begins with the words in question (t. viii. Append. 1) is not by Chrysostom.

^t Pallad. 30.

certain accusations. A synod was held early in the following year, and Chrysostom was charged before it with having violated the twelfth canon of Antioch (originally enacted against St. Athanasius)^u by resuming his see without ecclesiastical sanction after deposition by a council. His friends—for he had forty-two bishops on his side—replied that the canon did not apply to his case, and, moreover, that it was the work of heretics; one of them caused some confusion among the opposite party by proposing, in the emperor's presence, that those who wished to act on the canon should sign the creed of its authors. The objections, however, were overruled, and Chrysostom was condemned.^x

At the approach of Easter, Arcadius, urged on by the archbishop's enemies, intimated to him that, after having been deposed by two synods, he must not enter the church. On Easter-Eve, during the administration of baptism which was customary on that vigil, several of the churches were attacked by soldiers, who drove out the congregations—among them the women who were undrest for baptism—and committed gross profanations. The candidates for baptism took refuge first in the Baths of Constantine, where the administration of the sacrament was continued, and, when driven thence, in a circus outside the walls, from which also they were dislodged;^y it would seem, however, that Chrysostom was afterwards allowed to resume possession of the churches. Within a short space of time two attempts were made on his life by assassins.^z In Whitsun-week the emperor sent him a mandate to leave the episcopal house. As it was evident that he must now yield to force, he took a solemn farewell of his friends, addressing suitable admonitions to each class, and entreating them not to despair for the loss of an individual, but to receive any bishop who should be unanimously appointed; and, while his mule was held in waiting at one door of the cathedral, in order to divert the attention of his people, who for weeks had guarded him day and night, he left the building by an opposite door, and gave himself up, declaring that he referred his cause to an impartial council.^a

The discovery of his removal from Constantinople produced a great excitement. Next day the cathedral and the splendid palace of the senate were burnt.^b Each party charged the other with incendiarism; but the *Joannites* (as Chrysostom's adherents were

^u See p. 216.^v Pallad. 31-2; Soc. vi. 18.^y Chrys. ad Innoc. t. iii. 519; Pallad.

33-5; Soc. vi. 18; Soz. viii. 21.

^x Tillem. xi. 232; Neand. Chrys. ii.

180.

^z Pallad. 35-6; Soz. viii. 22.^a Zosim. v. 24.

called), being obnoxious to the imperial government, were cruelly treated on account of the fire, and some of them were put to death. Among others, Olympias was questioned on suspicion of having been concerned in the fire. "My life hitherto," she said, "is an answer to the charge. One who has spent much on building churches is not a likely person to destroy them."^c Arsacius, a man of eighty, brother to Nectarius, was appointed to the see of Constantinople, and, after having feebly held it for a year, was succeeded by Atticus.^d In the mean time the Joannites saw the vengeance of heaven in earthquakes and hailstorms, in the death of Eudoxia (Oct. 6th, 404), and in the calamities which befell other prominent enemies of the expelled archbishop.^e

Chrysostom, after having been carried across the Bosphorus, was allowed to remain nearly a month at Nicæa. He earnestly pressed for an investigation of his cause, but in vain.^f It was in vain, too, that both he and his friends entreated that some tolerable residence might be assigned as the place of his banishment. After a toilsome and tedious journey, in which he was in danger from robbers, and much more from fanatical monks,^g he reached Cucusus, among the ridges of Mount Taurus, the scene of the exile and death of his predecessor Paul.^h During his residence in this remote and wretched little town, he suffered from want of provisions, from the alternate excesses of heat and cold, from frequent sicknesses, in which it was impossible to obtain medicines, and from the ravages of Isaurian robbers, which at length compelled him to take shelter in the fortress of Arabissus.ⁱ But the years of his banishment were fuller of honour and influence than any portion of his previous life. He kept up a correspondence with churches in all quarters;^k even the Bishop of Rome, Innocent, who was strongly interested in his favour, treated him on terms of equality.^l From the Bishop of Cucusus and his other neighbours he met with reverential kindness.^m Many pilgrims sought him out in his secluded abode, from a desire to express their veneration for him. He directed missionary labours in Persia and among the Goths;ⁿ while his friends at a distance

^c Soc. vi. 18; Baron. 404. 44, 52.

^d Soc. vi. 19; Tillem. xi. 235, 309; xii. 420. Palladius describes Arsacius as "more dumb than a fish, and more inefficient than a frog." 37.

^e Soc. vi. 19; Soz. viii. 27.

^f Neand. Chrys. ii. 154.

^g Epp. 8-14 (t. iii.). ^h See p. 222.

ⁱ Epp. 4, 6, 68-9, 146, &c.; Tillem. xi. 263, 314; Neand. Chrys. ii. 212-3.

^k *e. g.* Ep. 149 is addressed to Aurelius, bishop of Carthage.

^l Innoc. Ep. 12 (Patrol. xx.); Chrys. t. iii. 515-524; Pallad. 5-10; Soz. viii. 26; Tillem. xi. 263, seqq.

^m Ep. 14. ⁿ Ib.

supplied him with funds so amply, that he was not only able to support these missions and to redeem captives, but even had to request that their overflowing liberality might be directed into other channels.^o He wrote frequent letters of advice and consolation to the bishops and clergy who had been involved in his fall, and to his adherents at Constantinople, who were subjected to great severities for refusing to communicate with his intruded successors.^p The Western Emperor and the Bishop of Rome joined in desiring that his cause should be again tried by an impartial council of the whole Church;^q but the relations of the Empires towards each other were unfavourable to the success of the proposal, and some Western envoys to the court of Arcadius were imprisoned and were treated with great indignity.^r

After Chrysostom had spent three years in exile, the interest which he continued to excite provoked his enemies to still more rigorous measures against him. He was sentenced to be removed to Pityus, a town on the extreme frontier of the Empire, to the east of the Euxine; and in the summer of 407 he was carried off from Arabissus. On the journey his bodily ailments were renewed or aggravated by exposure to violent heat. At Comana, he requested his conductors to halt, as he felt the approach of death. He exchanged his mean dress for the best which he ^{Sept. 14,} possessed; he received the holy Eucharist, and, after ^{407.} uttering the words, "Glory be to God for all things!" he expired as he added "Amen."^s

The Joannites remained a separate body for some years longer. Theophilus—although after Chrysostom's banishment he wrote a brutal book against him, which was eagerly translated into Latin by Jerome^t—advised Atticus to deal leniently with them. Alexander of Antioch (the same who succeeded in putting an end to the Eustathian schism) led the way in acknowledging the orthodoxy of Chrysostom by inserting his name in the diptychs of his church,^u and the example was followed elsewhere; until at length Atticus, at the urgent entreaty of the people and the Court, and ^{A.D. 417.} with a view to obtaining the communion of the West,

^o Soz. viii. 27; Tillem. xi. 228-230, 272; Schröckh, x. 474; Neander, Chrys. ii. 194, 229.

^p Pallad. 38, 76-9; Chrys. Epp. t. iii.

^q Innoc. Epp. 7-9 (Patrol. xx.); Chrys. t. iii. 524, seqq.

^r Pallad. 13; Soz. viii. 28; Tillem. x. 640, xi. 248-250, 318.

^s Pallad. 39-40; Soz. viii. 28.

^t See Hieron. Ep. 114, and the note.

For Jerome's treatment of Chrysostom, see Schröckh, x. 240. Baronius (404. 135) wishes it to be believed that Jerome was so afflicted by Chrysostom's banishment as even to have fallen ill. But, as Tillemont (x. 264-5) points out, the real cause of his affliction was that the exile met with sympathy.

^u Theod. v. 35.

consented to admit the name into the diptychs of Constantinople.^x By this act, and by the general observance of a moderate and conciliatory policy, he regained many Joannites to his communion;^y and the schism was finally extinguished in 438, under the episcopate of Proclus, when the relics of the banished archbishop were translated from Comana. As the vessel which bore them approached the capital, the population swarmed forth over the Bosphorus in boats; and the emperor, Theodosius II., bending over the coffin, entreated the saint to forgive the guilt of Arcadius and Eudoxia.^z

But the see of Constantinople never recovered the wound which it had received in the banishment of Chrysostom. Its patriarchs, with few exceptions, were, from that time, nothing more than pliant officers of the Court.^a

^x Innoc. Ep. 22; Pagi, vii. 98-9; Tillem. x. 658, xi. 349, xii. 425.

^y Soc. vii. 2, 25.

^a Soz. vii. 41; Theod. v. 36; Gibbon, iv. 478.

^z Milman, iii. 438.

CHAPTER VIII.

ST. AUGUSTINE.—DONATISM.—PELAGIANISM.

I. THE great light of the Western Church in this age was St. Augustine, a teacher of wider and more lasting influence than any since the Apostles. The history of his earlier years is given by himself in the well-known "Confessions," where he solemnly acknowledges his errors, and magnifies the gracious Providence which had guided him through many perils and conflicts to truth and peace.

Augustine was born in 354, at Thagaste, an episcopal city of Numidia.^a His father, Patricius, a man of curial rank, but in indifferent circumstances, was then a heathen;^b but his mother, Monica, a devout and exemplary Christian,^c caused the boy to be admitted in infancy as a catechumen of the Church. He tells us that when alarmed by a sudden and dangerous illness in his childhood, he earnestly desired baptism, and that preparations were made for administering it; but, as the danger passed over, it was considered better that the sacrament should be deferred, lest he should incur a heavier guilt by falling into sin after receiving the baptismal grace.^d Patricius, although himself a man of loose habits,^e and careless of his son's moral and religious training, exerted himself even beyond his means to obtain for him a good literary education, in the hope that it would lead to some honourable and lucrative employment;^f and with this view Augustine, after having acquired the elements of learning at Thagaste, was sent to pursue his studies at the schools of Madaura and Carthage. It would seem that his abilities were conspicuous from an early age, but that his application of them was uncertain and capricious; he read the Latin poets with eager fondness, but disliked the study of Greek, and his boyish neglect of that language was but very imperfectly remedied in after life.^g At the age of seventeen,

^a Nov. 13. Pagi, v. 439. Binde-
mann's date is 353. 'Der heil. Augus-
tinus,' i. 1—a work which in the two
volumes as yet published (Berl. 1844-
55) reaches to Augustine's election as
bishop.

^b Confess. i. 11.

^c Bindemann points out a part of her

character which is often overlooked—
that she was an active housewife, and
possessed a shrewd and ready humour.
i. 5.

^d Confess. i. 11.

^e Ib. ix. 9.

^f Ib. ii. 3.

^g Ib. i. 12-4; ii. 3; Bind. i. 14.

about the time of his removal to Carthage, he lost his father, who had at last been persuaded, by the discreet and gentle conduct of Monica as well as by her arguments, to embrace the Christian faith.^h A rich citizen of Thagaste, Romanian, assisted the widow to bear the expense of her son's education,ⁱ and Augustine's talents promised to render him distinguished. But he had early fallen into dissolute courses; he took a concubine, and became, at the age of eighteen, the father of a boy, to whom he gave the name of Adeodatus.^k

In his nineteenth year, the reading of Cicero's "Hortensius" awakened in Augustine a longing after a higher life; but on turning to the Scriptures in search of wisdom, he found them simple and uninviting.^l The specious promises of the Manichæans, their ridicule of submission to authority, and their speculations as to the origin of evil, attracted him.^m This sect had made considerable progress during the course of the fourth century; it had profited by the dissensions of the Church, and perhaps in a greater degree by receiving accessions from the old and decaying Gnostic parties.ⁿ Although many laws spoke of it as more abominable than other heresies, and enacted penalties of especial severity against its professors,^o proselytism was actively carried on in secret, and the Manichæan doctrines lurked even among the clergy and the monks. Augustine became a convert to these doctrines, and was a member of the sect from his nineteenth to his twenty-eighth year.^p But after a time he was startled and disgusted by observing the sensuality and hypocrisy of the "elect," who were bound to profess the most ascetic strictness, and also by the discoveries which he made as to the immoral and revolting maxims of the sectaries.^q He looked for a solution of his doubts to Faustus, a Manichæan bishop of great fame, who was expected to visit Carthage; but, when Faustus came, he found him to be not free from the usual inconsistency, and his discourse to be as empty as it was fluent and showy.^r Augustine had taught grammar and rhetoric, first at his native town and then at Carthage; but he found the disorderly habits of the Carthaginian students in-

^h Conf. ix. 9; Tillem. xiii. 15; Bind. i. 7, 23.

ⁱ Aug. c. Academ. ii. 3; Bind. i. 24.

^k Conf. ii. 3; iii. 2; De Util. Crendendi, i. 2.

^l Conf. iii. 4-5.

^m Ib. 5; Villemain, Éloq. Chrét. 379; Bind. i. 39-43, 92-5.

ⁿ Niebuhr, Vortr. iii. 314.

^o "Qui ad imum usque scelerum per-

venerunt Manichæi." Theod. et Valent. A.D. 428, Cod. Just. I. v. 5. Under the same title there are later laws against the sect. See above, p. 284; Schröckh, xi. 241-258.

^p Conf. iii. 11; iv. 1.

^q De Mor. Manich. ii. 67, seqq.; Tillem. xiii. 34-7; Bind. i. 134-141.

^r Conf. v. 3-6; c. Faust. v. 7.

tolerable,^s and in order to escape from this annoyance—not (he assures us) from any desire of greater fame or profit—he removed to Rome in 383.^t Soon after his arrival he fell seriously ill; but he felt no inclination to beg for baptism, as in the sickness of his childhood. On his recovery, his dislike of Manichæism was stronger than before, and for a time he was given over to the desolateness of universal scepticism.^u The prospect of earning a maintenance at Rome became doubtful; for he found that the Roman youth, although not so unruly as those of Africa, were apt to desert a professor without paying for the lectures which they had heard; and after a residence of about six months in the capital, he was glad to obtain an appointment as a public teacher of rhetoric at Milan.^x

Here he attended the sermons of Ambrose—not for the sake of religious instruction, but in order to ascertain whether the bishop's eloquence deserved its fame. But by degrees the words of Ambrose produced an effect. Augustine found that the Manichæan objections against the Catholic faith were mostly founded on ignorance and misapprehension;^y the preacher's allegorical explanations of the Old Testament showed him a way (although in truth a very dangerous way) by which he might escape from the difficulties of Scripture—"the letter that killeth."^z Monica, who had strongly opposed his departure from Africa, rejoined him at Milan. She had watched his errors with deep anxiety and sorrow. Her prayers had been rewarded by visions A.D. 384,
Autumn. which assured her that he would one day be converted; and, in the hope of bringing about the change, she had begged an aged bishop to converse with him. The bishop, a man of wisdom and learning, told her that it would be useless to argue with her son while flushed with the novelty of the Manichæan doctrines, but that if left to himself for a time, he could hardly fail to discover the vanity and impiety of the system; he himself, he added, had been a member of the sect in his youth, and had seen reason to forsake its errors. Monica still continued to urge her petition even with tears; but the bishop dismissed her with the assurance that it was "impossible that the child of so many tears should perish;" and the words were treasured up as if they had been a voice from heaven.^a She now had the delight of finding her son no longer a Manichæan, but a Christian catechumen; for he had

^s Conf. v. 8.^t Ib.

See specimens of Anti-Manichæan interpretation, c. Faust. l. xxii.

^u Ib. 9-10.^u Ib. 12-3.^a Conf. iii. 11-2.^y De Mor. Eccl. Cath. i. 10.^z Conf. iii. 5-7; v. 10, 13-4; vi. 3-4.

resolved to resume that character until he could obtain some certainty of conviction; and she confidently expressed to him the hope of seeing him a Catholic believer before her death.^b His baser passions, however, were not yet overcome.^c

Through various difficulties Augustine struggled onwards. He had found much support for his mind in the Platonic writings, while yet they failed to satisfy his cravings.^d He now devoted himself to the study of St. Paul, with feelings far different from those which in his nineteenth year had led him to slight the simplicity of the Scriptures; and he found that the difficulties and seeming inconsistencies which had once repelled him, vanished away.^e He was greatly impressed with an account which a friend gave him of Antony and other monks; the vileness of his own past life rose up before his mind, and excited violent agitations.^f One day, when unable, in the wild conflict of his thoughts, to bear even the society of his dearest friend Alypius, he rushed forth into the garden of his lodging, cast himself down under a fig-tree, and, with a gush of tears, passionately cried out for deliverance from the bondage of his sins. While thus engaged, he heard, as if from a neighbouring house, the voice of a child singing repeatedly "Take up and read." He could not remember that such words were used in any childish game; he bethought himself of the impression made on St. Antony by the Scriptures which were read in church,^g and believed that he was himself now called by a voice from heaven. Returning to the house, he seized the volume of St. Paul's epistles, and opened on the text, "Not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying: but put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh to fulfil the lusts thereof."^h From that moment Augustine felt himself another man;ⁱ but, as he did not wish to attract notice by any display of the change, he continued to perform the duties of his professorship until the vintage vacation, when he resigned it, and retired into the country with his mother and some friends. On Easter-Eve, 387, he was baptized by St. Ambrose, together with his son Adeodatus, and Alypius his countryman and pupil, whom he had formerly drawn into Manichæism, and who eventually became bishop of Thagaste.^k In compliance with Monica's wishes, he soon after set out towards Africa; but at

^b Conf. v. 14; vi. 1; De Util. Cred. 20.

^c Conf. vi. 13-5.

^d Ib. vii. 9, 20; Neander, iii. 504; Ritter, vii. 160.

^e Conf. vii. 21.

^f See pp. 213-4.

^g Conf. viii. 12.

^h Ib. ix. 2-6.

ⁱ Ib. viii. 6-10.

^j Rom. xiii. 13-4.

Ostia the pious matron died, rejoicing that the desire of her heart was fulfilled in the conversion of her son.¹

As there was now no reason for hastening his return to Africa, Augustine repaired to Rome, where he resided upwards of a year, and produced, among other works, two books on the contrast between Catholic and Manichæan morality.^m Towards the end of 388 he resumed his journey, and, after a short stay at Carthage, he settled at his native place, where he gave up his property to pious and charitable uses, and for nearly three years lived in studious and devotional retirement, which was shared by Alypius and other friends.ⁿ His earlier history and his conversion, his sacrifice of worldly goods, his religious life and his writings, spread his fame far and wide, so that he was afraid to appear in any city where the bishoprick was vacant, lest he should be forcibly seized and compelled to accept the dignity. He supposed himself, however, to be safe in accepting an invitation to Hippo the Royal (so called from having been anciently the residence of the Numidian kings),^o as the see was filled by Valerius; but as he was in church, listening to the bishop's sermon, Valerius A.D. 391. began to speak of the necessity of ordaining an additional presbyter; whereupon the people presented Augustine, and he was forced to submit to ordination.^p Valerius admitted him to his confidence, and gave him a large share in the administration of the diocese. Being a Greek by birth, the bishop felt a difficulty in preaching in Latin, and was glad to relieve himself by employing Augustine as his substitute; and, although it was at first objected to, as a novelty in Africa, that a presbyter should preach in the presence of a bishop, the example was soon imitated in other dioceses.^q At the end of four years, Valerius, on the ground that his own age and infirmity rendered the assistance of a coadjutor necessary, desired that Augustine might be consecrated as his colleague in the see of Hippo; and Augustine was obliged to yield. Both he and Valerius were then ignorant that the eighth Nicene canon forbade the establishment of two bishops in the same city, except in cases where one was a reconciled Novatianist.^r

Valerius did not long survive the appointment of his colleague.^s

¹ Conf. ix. 10-2.

^m "De Moribus Eccl. Cath., et de Moribus Manichæorum" (Opera, t. i.).

ⁿ Possidius, 2-3; Tillem. xiii. 119-125; Bindem. ii. 47-126. Adeodatus seems to have died during this period. See Bind. ii. 89.

^o Bind. ii. 128.

^p Possid. 4.

^q Ib. 5; Tillem. xiii. 147-8, 152.

^r Possid. viii.; Pagi, vi. 210; Schröckh, xv. 325-6.

^s Tillem. xiii. 285.

Augustine held the bishoprick of Hippo for five-and-thirty years, A.D. 395–^{430.} and, although the city was inferior in importance to many others, his genius and character caused him to be acknowledged, without any assumption on his own part, as the leader of the African Church.^t The vast collection of his works includes treatises on Christian doctrine and practice, expositions of Scripture, controversial books against Manichæans, Donatists, Pelagians, and other sectaries, a great number of sermons,^u and upwards of two hundred and fifty letters, among which are many elaborate answers to questions of theology and casuistry. His greatest work, “Of the City of God,” was written, as has been already mentioned,^x in consequence of the force with which the old pagan objection against Christianity, as the cause of public calamities, was urged after the capture of Rome by the Goths.^y The composition of this treatise was begun in 412 or 413, and was not finished until 426. In the first five books, Augustine meets the argument from the calamities of the times; in the next five, he argues against those who, while they allowed that paganism had not, in the days of its ascendancy, secured its votaries against temporal evils, yet maintained that it was availing for the next life; and in the remaining twelve books, he contrasts the two polities—the earthly and the “City of God”—in their origin, their course, and their end.^z Some defects of the work are obvious: as,—that the reasoning is not always satisfactory; that much of what is said has no visible bearing on the theme; that here, as elsewhere, Augustine is driven, by his want of acquaintance with the original languages, to evade questions as to the real meaning of Scripture, and to take refuge in allegories and forced applications. It is said, also, that the learning which appears so copious is in reality borrowed from secondary sources.^a But, on the whole, it deserves to be regarded as a work alike noble in the conception and in the execution, the last and most important of the apologies against paganism, the first of professed treatises on the Church.^b

The exemplary labours of Augustine in his diocese cannot be

^t Thus Prosper says of a Council which condemned Pelagius:—

“Cui dux Aurelius, ingeniumque Augustinus erat.” *De Ingratis*, 91-2.

^u His preaching is treated at great length in Prof. Bindemann’s second volume.

^x P. 370.

^y *De Civ. Dei*, i. 2.

^z *Aug. Retract.* ii. 43.

^a See Dupin, iii. 237; Schröckh, vii. 247–313; Ozanam, *Civil. Chrét.* au 5me Siècle, ii. 215. Schröckh throughout speaks of St. Augustine in an unjustifiable tone of disparagement.

^b Milman, iii. 277–282.

here detailed ; but it is necessary to notice at some length the two principal controversies in which he was engaged—the sequel of that with the Donatists, and the new controversy which was occasioned by the opinions of Pelagius.

II. After their condemnation by Constans in 348,^c the Donatists remained in exile until the reign of Julian. As the edict by which that emperor recalled persons who were ^{A.D. 362.} suffering on account of religion^d applied to such only as had been banished by his immediate predecessor, these sectaries could not benefit by it. They therefore presented a petition to Julian, expressing respect for his character and reliance on his justice in terms which were not only inconsistent with their former attitude towards the civil power, but afforded their opponents ground for reproaching them with flattery of the apostate and persecutor.^e The petition was successful, and they signalized their return from banishment by triumphant displays of intolerance. “If they obtained possession of a church which had been used by the Catholics, they washed the pavement, scraped the walls, burnt the altar, which was commonly of wood, melted the consecrated plate, and cast the holy eucharist to the dogs.”^f The Donatists were now the stronger party in Numidia, and were powerful throughout the African provinces ; but after the brief reign of Julian, they again became obnoxious to the government, and several laws were directed against them. Valentinian I., by an exception to his general policy of abstaining from interference with religion, enacted penalties against their practice of re-baptizing (A.D. 373).^g Gratian, in 377, ordered that their churches should be given up to the Catholics, and that any places where they should hold meetings should be confiscated ;^h and in the following year, at the request of a Roman council, he expelled their bishop from Rome.ⁱ These laws do not appear to have been rigidly executed ; but in other ways the interest of Donatism suffered during the latter part of the fourth century.

The working of the schismatical spirit produced many divisions in the sect—each little fraction maintaining that it alone retained

^c P. 197.^d P. 245.

in public places for their confusion.

^e E. g. Optatus, ii. 16 ; Aug. c. Ep. Parmen. 1-12 ; c. Litt. Petil. ii. 203. Honorius, in a law of A.D. 400 (Cod. Theod. XVI. v. 37), ordered that copies of their application to Julian and of his law in their favour should be posted up

^f Gibbon, ii. 188 ; Optat. ii. 17, 19, 21 ; vi. 1, 2, 5, 6 ; Aug. c. Litt. Petil. ii. 184.

^g Dupin, Append. ad Optat. 314.^h Ib. 316.ⁱ Hard. i. 840, 843.

the true baptism, and excommunicating all the rest.^k The most considerable separation took place after the death of Parmenian, who had succeeded Donatus as leader of the party, and for forty years had guided it with vigour and skill.^l In 392 he was succeeded by Primian, who soon after had a violent quarrel with a deacon named Maximian, and excommunicated him. The original history of the schism was now repeated by rival factions of the Donatists. Maximian found a new Lucilla in a wealthy lady. Primian was condemned by two councils,—the second consisting of more than a hundred bishops; he was declared to be A.D. 393-4. deposed, and twelve bishops joined in consecrating Maximian to the see of Carthage.^m But without paying any regard to these proceedings, Primian assembled a council of three hundred and ten bishops at Bagai; Maximian was condemned; he and his consecrators were ejected from their churches by the assistance of the civil power, and in some cases not without violence and cruelty; while the other Maximianist bishops were invited to rejoin the communion of Primian within a certain time, with a promise that their baptism and orders should be acknowledged as valid. In this affair, every principle of the original schism was either violated by the victorious party or carried out to manifest absurdity by the vanquished; and the history of it supplied the Catholic controversialists with weapons which they did not fail to turn to account.ⁿ

The leader in the literary warfare against Donatism was Optatus, bishop of Milevis, who about 370, in answer to a book by Parmenian, ably exposed both the history of the schism and the grounds on which its adherents professed to rest it.^o About the same time a grammarian, named Tichonius, although himself a Donatist, did much to injure his party, by a treatise in which he maintained that the Church could not be confined to one corner, but must be diffused throughout the world; that the sins of the

^k Baron. 394. 41; Tillem. vi. 150-2; Schröckh, xi. 384.

^l Parmenian was not an African by birth, and Optatus supposes that he must have been misled by false accounts of the schism, ii. 3.

^m Dupin, Append. 319-322; Aug. Ep. xliii. 26; Baron. 394. 34, seqq.; Pagi, vi. 154-7; Tillem. vi. 160-4; Walch, iv. 262-8.

ⁿ E. g. Collat. Carth. ap. Hard. i. 1060, 1070-1; Aug. Brevic. Collat. iii. 9, seqq.; c. Ep. Parmen. i. 8, seqq.; c. Litt. Petil. iii. 45-6; c. Crescon. l. iv.; Gesta c. Emerito, 9.

^o "De Schismate Donatistarum" (Pa-

trol. xi.). It was enlarged after its first publication (Dupin, Præf. i. 2). There was another Optatus, Donatistic bishop of Thamugade, who attached himself to the tyrant Gildo, by means of whose soldiery he for ten years exercised great barbarities against the Catholics of his neighbourhood, until in 398 he was involved in his patron's ruin, and died in prison. Augustine often reproaches the Donatists with this "Gildonian's" proceedings, as inconsistent with their pretensions to purity of communion. See an account of him in Tillemont, vi. 180-4.

evil members do not cause a failure of God's promises to it; and that baptism administered without the true Church might be valid.^p But Augustine became the most formidable and effective opponent of Donatism.

When ordained a presbyter, he found that the Donatists were the majority in Hippo, where he tells us, in illustration of the sectarian spirit, that their bishop would not allow any of his flock to *bake* for their Catholic neighbours.^q Augustine's first contribution to the controversy (A.D. 393) was a "psalm" or metrical piece, intended to furnish the less educated people with some knowledge of the question, in a form which might assist the memory;† it opens by setting forth the scriptural doctrine as to the mixture of evil with good in the visible Church, sketches the history of the schism, and, after twenty parts, which begin with the successive letters of the alphabet, concludes with exhortations to unity.^s This attack was followed up from time to time by treatises in answer to the most eminent Donatistic champions, and by letters to members of the sect, which are usually written in an admirable spirit of charity and courtesy. Augustine also endeavoured to bring the Donatists to conferences; but he rarely succeeded. Sometimes the refusal was rested on the ground that his dialectical skill would give him an unfair advantage;‡ sometimes it was in a more insolent form—that the children of the martyrs could not condescend to argue with sinners and traditors.^u His attempts at conciliation were repelled by the obstinate bigotry of the sect.^x With a view to the common maintenance of discipline, he proposed that, when a person who was under censure of either community applied for admission into the other, it should not be granted except on condition of his submitting to penance; but although Augustine himself scrupulously observed this rule, he was unable to establish a mutual agreement in it, as the Donatists, for the sake of swelling their numbers, not only belied their profession by retaining notorious offenders in their communion, but indiscriminately received all sorts of proselytes.^y

^p Aug. adv. Parmen. i. 1; Gennad. de Script. Eccl. 18; Neander, iii. 296. In explanation of his continuing with these views to be a Donatist, it has been suggested that he may have written with a design of reconciling his party and the Catholics, and, until a reunion could be effected, may have preferred that communion which made the greater pretensions to purity. Schröckh, xi. 381.

^q Contr. Litt. Petil. ii. 184.

^r Retract. i. 20.

^s Aug. ix. 33, seqq. (This volume contains the treatises against the Donatists, with an Appendix of documents.)

^t C. Litt. Petil. iii. 19; c. Crescon. i. 16.

^u Ad Donat. post Collat. 37.

^x Tillem. xiii. 380.

^y Epp. xxxiv.-v.

The councils of the African Catholics made frequent reference to the Donatists, and generally in a moderate and conciliatory tone. They offered, even when impeded by decrees which had forbidden such concessions, to recognize the Donatist clergy in their orders and positions.^z The clergy interposed to moderate the execution of the laws against the sectaries;^a and by various means—especially by making known the earlier documents of the schism—they gained many converts to the Church.^b The success of their exertions exasperated the fury of the Circumcellions, who committed barbarous outrages against the Catholic clergy, and rendered it unsafe for Catholics to live in country places; while the bishops of the sect were either afraid or unwilling to interfere or to grant redress.^c Augustine himself had a providential escape from a plot which had been arranged for waylaying him. Other bishops were so cruelly abused, that the Council of Africa, in 404, found it necessary to petition Honorius that the laws against heretics might be applied to the Donatists.^d The reports of the outrages which had been committed, and especially the appearance of some of the sufferers at the imperial court, provoked severer measures than those which the council had contemplated. The old edicts against the Donatists were revived, and they were sentenced to heavy fines, to forfeiture of their churches, Feb. 405. banishment of their bishops and clergy, and confiscation of lands on which they might attempt to hold their worship.^e In consequence of this, the Church received a large accession of converts, of whom it is probable that some were insincere, and that others, having inherited their Donatism without any personal conviction of its tenets, had until then been held in terror by the Circumcellions.^f

The law of February, 405, was followed by others of like purport.^g On the death of Stilicho, the Donatists, pre- A.D. 408. tending that these were his work and had expired with him,^h began to resume possession of churches and to renew their violent proceedings. But the laws were reinforced by new edicts,

^z Dupin, *Append.* 328 (A.D. 401); *Litt. Petil.* ii. 184.
Tillem. xiii. 348-351.

^a *Tillem.* vi. 155-160.

^b *Conc. Carthag.* A.D. 401, ap. *Aug.* ix. 801; *Aug. c. Crescon.* iii. 49; *Re-tract.* ii. 27; *Tillem.* xiii. 390-2.

^c *Aug. Epp.* lxxxviii. 6-8; cv. 3-4; c. *Crescon.* iii. 46. He says that all Catholics would be driven out of rural places, were it not that the Donatists of the cities were hostages for them. C.

^d Dupin, *App.* 332; *Aug. c. Cres.* iii. 47, seqq.; *Tillem.* xiii. 398-401.

^e Dupin, *App.* 334-7; *Baron.* 405. 25; *Tillem.* xiii. 406-8, 416-7, 992.

^f *Baron.* 405. 30-7; *Tillem.* xiii. 422-3; *Walch.* iv. 195; *Schröckh.* xi. 428-9.

^g See the *Cod. Theod.* XVI. v.-vi.; or Dupin, *App.* 339-343.

^h *Aug. Ep.* xcvii.

and such of the sectaries as should molest the Catholics were threatened with capital punishment.ⁱ On this Augustine wrote to the proconsul of Africa, begging that the law might not be executed to the full; if, he said, the Donatists be put to death, the Catholic clergy, who are the persons best acquainted with their proceedings, and most interested in restraining them, will shrink from giving information against them.^k In 410, Honorius, alarmed by the pressure of the Barbarians, granted a general freedom of religion for Africa; but at the urgent request of the Catholics, the indulgence was revoked, and banishment and even death were denounced against those who should hold heretical assemblies.^l

The Catholics now entreated the emperor to appoint a conference between the two parties. The request was granted —the willingness of the Donatists being presumed A.D. 411. from their language on some former occasions—and Marcellinus, a “tribune and notary” (or secretary of state), was deputed to superintend the discussion.^m The commissioner is highly praised for his piety and virtues by Jerome and by Augustine,ⁿ and the patience, moderation, and judgment which he displayed in this affair appear to justify their eulogies.^o In the citation addressed to the Donatists, it was said that such of them as would attend the conference should in the mean time enjoy possession of their churches, with an exemption from all laws against the sect; that, whatever the result of the meeting might be, they should have liberty to return to their homes; but that, if the party should refuse to obey the summons, conformity to the Catholic Church would be forthwith enforced: and Marcellinus offered, if the Donatists objected to him as judge, to associate with himself any person, of equal or superior dignity, whom they might choose.^p

Two hundred and eighty-six Catholic bishops were gradually assembled at Carthage. The Donatists made a display of their strength by entering the city in a body, to the number of two

ⁱ Dupin, App. 344, seqq.

^k Ep. c.; Schröckh's (xi. 437-9) inferences are unfair to Augustine.

^l Dupin, Append. 347; Schröckh, xi. 435-6.

^m Hard. i. 1052, D.; Baron. 410. 49; Tillem. xiii. 499-501. The acts of the conference are in Hardouin, vol. i. (from which the quotations are made), and in the Appendix to Optatus. For the latter part of the discussion, we have

only the abridgment by Augustine. (*Breviculus Collationis*, in vol. ix. of his works.)

ⁿ Ep. cli. 8. Augustine inscribed to him some of his books—among them the ‘City of God,’ which was written at the suggestion of Marcellinus. See n. on *De Civ. Dei*, i. 1.

^o Baron. 410. 58; Tillem. xiii. 501-2; Walch, iv. 215; Schröckh, xi. 442-6.

^p Hard. i. 1052-3.

hundred and seventy-nine;^q they asserted, but seemingly without truth, that in their absent brethren they had a majority over the Catholics.^r Their leader was Petilian, bishop of Cirta or Constantine, who had formerly been a distinguished advocate, and, when a catechumen, had been forcibly baptized into the sect and raised to the episcopate.^s The Catholics announced that, if convinced of the Church's failure everywhere but in the Donatistic communion, they would submit without requiring a recognition of their orders; but that, if they should be able to convince their opponents, the Donatist bishops and clergy should be acknowledged as such, and an arrangement should be made for the joint government of the Churches.^t Although the former of these alternatives might have been offered without any risk, the latter deserves the praise of a really liberal and conciliatory spirit.

The conference was held on the 1st, the 3rd, and the 8th of June, 411. The first day was taken up by formalities—Petilian's forensic skill being employed in raising technical difficulties, for the purpose of evading the main subjects of dispute. The Commissioner renewed his offer of admitting an assessor; but Petilian answered that, as the Donatists had not asked for the first judge, it was not their part to ask for a second.^u Marcellinus proposed that each party should choose seven disputants, seven advisers, and four other bishops, who should see to the authenticity of reports and documents; and that, with a view to orderly discussion, no other persons than these representatives, with the secretaries and public officers, should be admitted to the place of conference. To this the Donatists objected, as they supposed themselves to be more numerous than their opponents, and wished to make a visible display of their superiority;^v but, after the lists of bishops on each side had been recited and carefully verified, the sectaries found it expedient to comply with the proposed arrangement.^x Between the reading of the two lists, Marcellinus desired the bishops to sit down; to which the leader of the Donatists replied, with an elaborate compliment to the Commissioner, that, as our Lord stood before his judge, it was not for them to sit in the presence of so worshipful a person. Marcellinus would not sit while the bishops stood, and consequently all parties remained

^q Hard. i. 1111-2.

^r The Catholics are said to have had in all Africa 470 bishops; the Donatists, 400 (Schröckh, xi. 443). Augustine charges the sectaries with falsely exaggerating their numbers. Ep. cxli. 1.

^s Aug. c. Litt. Petil. ii. 239; iii. 19; Tillem. xiii. 330-1, 375.

^t Aug. Ep. cxxviii.; Hard. i. 1057.

^u Hard. i. 1053.

^v Ib. 1054-6.

^x Ib. 1061, seqq.; Aug. Brevic. i. 12.

standing throughout the debate.^y Among the Catholic disputants were Aurelius of Carthage, Augustine, his friend Alypius, and his biographer Possidius.^z

At the next meeting Marcellinus again requested the bishops to seat themselves, whereupon Petilian produced another scriptural authority for refusing—the words of the Psalmist, “I will not sit with the wicked.”^a The second day was for the most part wasted in the same manner as the first;^b but on the third and last, after fresh attempts at evasion and delay on the part of the Donatists, the real question came into discussion, and Augustine, who until then had spoken little, stood forward as the leader of the Catholics. It is noted as characteristic that, when he styled the Donatists “brethren,” Petilian protested against the term as injurious.^c Each party wished to throw on the other the burden of opening the case: the Donatists said that the Catholics were bound to do so, as having demanded the conference; the Catholics, that the Donatists were the accusers of the Church, and therefore ought to state their charges.^d When Augustine entered on the history of the separation, the Donatists objected, and said that the matter ought to be determined by Scripture: to which the Catholics replied that they were willing to confine themselves to Scripture if their opponents would refrain from attacks on persons; but that, if Cæcilian and others were attacked, the documents necessary for their justification must be admitted.^e Marcellinus decided that the acts relating to the origin of the schism should be read;^f and eventually both the doctrinal question of the Church’s purity and the historical question were discussed.^g The documents produced by the Donatists were shown to bear against their own cause;^h for it would seem that the sect had forgotten all such parts of its history as were unfavourable to it.ⁱ They were at length forced to avow that they did not suppose the whole Church to be limited to their own body in Africa, but only denied that their African opponents were in communion with the Catholic churches beyond the seas.^k Marcellinus ended the conference by giving judgment

^y Hard. i. 1093.

^z Aug. Ep. cxli. 2.

^a Ib. 1115 (Ps. xxvi. 5). The Catholics at a later stage took the trouble of answering this. Brevic. iii. 9.

^b Hard. i. 1115–1123.

^c Hard. i. 1120; Aug. ad Don. post Collat. 58.

^d Hard. i. 1146, seqq.

^e Brevic. iii. 6.

^f Hard. i. 1175.

^g Brevic. iii. 8, seqq.

^h Ib. 13–4, 20–3.

ⁱ For example, the sectaries had kept no record of the Synod of Cirta (sup. p. 189). Aug. Ep. xliii.

^k Hard. i. 1159. Some Donatists interpreted the word *Catholic* as meaning the universal observance of the Divine precepts and of the sacraments. Ib.; Aug. Ep. xciii. 23.

against the Donatists. The promise of a safe conduct homewards was to be fulfilled to them, and a certain time was allowed, during which they might join the Church on the terms which the Catholics had offered; but in case of their refusal the penal statutes against them were to be revived.¹

It is evident that, if a power of supreme ecclesiastical jurisdiction had then been supposed to exist in the see of Rome, an affair such as that of the Donatists would not have been entrusted to a lay imperial commissioner.^m But on the other hand, the commission given to Marcellinus does not imply such a right or claim of jurisdiction on the part of the civil power as might perhaps be supposed if the circumstance stood by itself. The Donatistic controversy had arisen at the very time when Constantine began to show favour to the Christians; it was originally carried before the emperor by the sectaries; although doctrinal discussions as to the being of the Church were afterwards introduced into it, it was at first merely a question of disputed facts; and it had continued to engage the attention of the emperors, not in its doctrinal aspect, but because the disorders of the Circumcellions disturbed the peace of Africa. Thus it had been throughout regarded as specially belonging to the imperial cognisance, and the appointment of Marcellinus was a consequence of that view. Indeed the arbitration, which was urgently needed, could not well have been obtained from ecclesiastical authority; since all the Africans were parties in the case, and there were difficulties, perhaps insuperable, in the way of referring it to a synod beyond the seas, while a reference to the bishop of Rome does not appear to have been thought of as an expedient which could be admitted to decide the question.ⁿ

The Donatists asserted that they had been victorious in argument at the conference, and that Marcellinus was bribed by their opponents.^o They appealed to the emperor; but Honorius, without regarding the appeal, confirmed his commissioner's judgment, and in the following year enacted severe penalties against the sect. All who should refuse to conform to the Church were to be heavily fined, in proportion to their rank,

¹ Hard. i. 1190.

^m Mosh. i. 476.

ⁿ Walch, iv. 220; Schröckh, xi. 449-451. See n. in Fleury, ii. 193-4.

^o Aug. Ep. cxli. 1; Ad Donatistas post Collationem (a tract written to counteract the boasts of the sect), 16, 39, 57. Marcellinus was executed in 414

by Count Marinus, on false charges of treason. It has been supposed that Marinus was instigated by the Donatists, and hence Marcellinus has been styled a martyr (Baron. 413. 5; Tillem. xiii. 612-7); but Walch (iv. 226-8) and Schröckh (xi. 457) say that there is no ground for the belief.

and in case of continued obstinacy, they were to forfeit all their property. Slaves and peasants^p were to be beaten into conformity, and their masters, if they neglected to act on this order, were, "although Catholics," to be liable to the penalties of Donatism. It was forbidden to harbour the sectaries; their bishops and clergy were to be banished, and the buildings and estates belonging to the body were to be confiscated.^q

By another law, two years later, the penalties of the A.D. 414. former were increased; the Donatists were deprived of the right of bequeathing property, and were subjected to a sort of civil excommunication.^r The African Councils, however, still held out offers of conciliation, and the clergy, although they did not deny that such laws were justifiable, urged that the execution of them might be forborne or mitigated.^s In consequence of the measures of the government some Donatists were brought into the Church, while others were driven to a frenzy of desperation. Their outrages became more violent than ever. Many committed suicide, which they supposed to be an expiation for all their sins;^t and to threaten it was a favourite expedient when they found themselves pressed by the Catholics.^u Gaudentius, a bishop, who had been one of the disputants at the conference, declared that, if he were forcibly required to join the Catholic communion, he would shut himself up in a church with his adherents, and die like another Sardanapalus.^x It was against this zealot that Augustine wrote his last works in the Donatistic controversy, about the year 420.^y

Little is known of the Donatists after this time, although they

^p "Coloni."

^q Dupin, Append. 506-7. ^r Ib. 509.

^s Aug. Ep. cxxxiii.-iv., cxxxix.; Tillem. xiii. 589, 740-2. Augustine had been against all use of force in behalf of religion; but about 408 changed his opinion, in consequence of the apparent good results of the penal laws (Retract. ii. 5; Ep. xciii. 1-2). "We must not," he says, "consider that one is compelled, but what that is to which he is compelled—whether good or evil. Not that a man can be good against his will; but through fear of that which he does not wish to suffer, he either abandons the passion which hindered him, or is forced to discern the truth of which he was ignorant; so that, in fear, he either rejects the falsehood for which he contended, or seeks the truth which he knew not, and now willingly holds that which he once disliked" (Ep. xciii. 16). He

adds that at Hippo and in other towns the inhabitants had been converted to the Church by the penal laws (17). For the propriety of such measures he alleged the text, "*Compel them to come in.*" (Luc. xiv. 23.) See Ep. clxxxv. 24; Pagi, v. 554; Neand. iii. 303-7; Gieseler, I. ii. 318-9.

^t Aug. c. Gaudent. i. 46.

^u "Quantum cupiamus vos vivere, ipsi scitis; ideo nos de vestra morte terretis." Ib. 41.

^x Ib. 1.

^y One of the arguments is curious. You complain (says Augustine to the Donatists) that you have no place to flee unto. But, since Christ said, "When they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another," it appears that His people must always have a place to flee to, and therefore that you cannot be His. C. Gaud. i. 19; Tillem. xiii. 805.

were still occasionally noticed in imperial edicts.^z Under the Vandals their position was improved, but the sect soon dwindled into insignificance. Some remains of it, however, existed in the time of Gregory the Great, and it is supposed that it was not extinguished until the Saracenic invasion of Africa in the seventh century.^a

III. The Pelagian controversy was that as to which Augustine exercised the most powerful influence on his own age, and which has chiefly made his authority important throughout the succeeding times.^b The differences as to doctrine which had hitherto agitated the Church originated in the East, and related to the Godhead ; one was now to arise in the West, which had for its subject the nature of man and his relations to God. On these points there had as yet been no precise definitions ; but it had been generally acknowledged that the nature of man was seriously injured by the fall of Adam, and needed the assistance of Divine grace.^c In the Western Church, from the time of Tertullian, it was declared that Adam had transmitted to his posterity an inheritance of sinfulness,^d but the Latin teachers, as well as those of the East, had maintained that the will was free to choose good or evil, to receive or to reject salvation.^e Augustine himself, in his earlier writings after his conversion, maintained against the Manichæans the freedom of the will in preparing man for the reception of grace. Faith (he said) depends on man, although works are of God's grace ; the Divine election is spoken of by St. Paul (Rom. ix.) as opposed to a foundation of works—not to a foundation of faith ; and if there were no freedom there could be no responsibility.^f As early as 397, however, he had come to regard faith also as an effect of Divine grace ; and it would be more correct to describe Pelagianism as a reaction from Augustine's doctrine than to invert this order, although it was by Pelagianism that Augustine was urged to carry out his system into precision and completeness.^g

^z See the Append. to Optatus.

^a Tillem. vi. 192-3; Walch, iv. 229-231.

^b The tracts and documents relating to this controversy form vol. x. of the Benedictine edition, and of Migne's reprint.

^c See Wiggers, i. 407, seqq. Blunt on the Fathers, ser. II. lect. xiii. sec. 2.

^d See p. 165, n. ^q; Comp. Schröckh, xiv. 387; Wiggers, i. 430, seqq.

^e Wiggers, i. 410; Neand. iv. 283-5;

Giesel. I. ii. 107; vi. 338; Hagenbach, i. 293-6.

^f e. g. De Lib. Arbitr. ii. 2; Expos. Propositionum ex Ep. ad Rom. 60 (t. iii. 2079); c. Faust. xxii. 78. See Retract. i. 9; Wiggers, i. 133. He acknowledges his change of opinion (De Prædest. Sanctorum, 7), but was able to point to works which showed that he had maintained his later doctrine as to grace before Pelagianism emerged. De Dono Persev. 52-3.

^g Neand. iv. 298; Giesel. I. ii. 116-7;

Pelagius was a Briton—the first native of our island who distinguished himself in literature or theology. His Greek or Latin name is, according to a tradition, the translation of the British *Morgan*—sea-born.^h He is described as a monk,ⁱ and it has been supposed that he belonged to the great monastery of Bangor; but the term most probably means only that he was an ascetic, without implying that he was a member of any monastic community.^k From his acquaintance with the Greek ecclesiastical writers it is inferred that he had resided in the east, and he has been identified by some with a monk of the same name who is mentioned in one of Chrysostom's letters.^l About the end of the fourth century he took up his abode at Rome, where he became intimate with Paulinus of Nola, and other persons of saintly reputation.^m Jerome in controversy expresses scorn of his abilities, and represents his habits as luxurious; but such aspersions are matters of course with Jerome, and, although Orosius also charges Pelagius with luxury and excess,ⁿ we may rather rely on the testimony of Augustine, who always spoke of his adversary with high respect for his religious character.^o In his tone of thought Pelagius was rather oriental than western.^p The course of his religious life appears to have been steady—in striking contrast to the fierce agitations by which Augustine had been made to pass through such a variety of experiences. His indignation was raised by the manner in which many persons alleged the weakness of human nature as an excuse for carelessness or slothfulness in religion; in opposition to this he insisted on the freedom of the will; and he is said to have expressed great displeasure at hearing a bishop repeat a well-known prayer of Augustine—"Give what Thou commandest, and command what Thou wilt."^q But, although he found adherents at Rome, both his age, which was already advanced, and his temper disinclined Pelagius to any public declaration of his opinions.^r In one of his works—an exposition of St. Paul's epistles, which has escaped the

Ritter, vi. 180; Mozley on Predestination, 380-1.

^h See Prosper de Ingratis, 2; Præf. ad Aug. t. x. 9; Walch, iv. 534-5. Mr. Herbert supposes him of Roman parentage, though of British birth. Cyclops Christianus, 77.

ⁱ Aug. de Gestis Pelag. 36.

^k Præf. ad Aug. x. 9; Walch, iv. 536; Wiggers, i. 34.

^l See Præf. ad Aug. x. 10; Wiggers, i. 36. Chrysostom laments that Pelagius, of whose character he speaks highly, had been led astray—i. e. that

he had deserted the archbishop's party. Ep. 4, t. iii. p. 577.

^m Aug. de Gestis Pel. 50, 53; Præf. 11.

ⁿ De Arbitr. Libertate, 16, 31 (Patrol. xxxi.).

^o As De Peccat. Mer. et Rem. iii. 1; Ep. clxxxvi. i.

^p Neand. iv. 299.

^q Confess. x. 29. This is stated by St. Augustine himself, De Dono Perseverantiæ, 53. Neand. iv. 300-308.

^r Tillem. xiii. 562; Walch, iv. 570.

general fate of heretical books by being included through mistake among the writings of his enemy Jerome—there are many indications of his errors; but the objectionable opinions are there introduced in the way of discussion—not as if they were the author's own.^s

At Rome Pelagius became acquainted with Cœlestius, who, from an expression of Jerome,^t has been supposed to have been a Scot—*i. e.* a native of Ireland. Cœlestius was a man of family, had practised as an advocate, and had forsaken that profession for an ascetic life.^u Whether he learnt his opinions from Pelagius, or had before adopted them from another teacher, is doubtful. Jerome bestows his customary abuse on Cœlestius; Augustine describes him as bolder and less crafty than Pelagius.^x

After the sack of Rome, the two friends passed into Africa, where Pelagius remained but a short time; and it does

A.D. 410. not appear that after this separation they ever met again, or even corresponded with each other.^y Cœlestius endeavoured to obtain ordination as a presbyter at Carthage, but was charged with heresy by Paulinus, formerly a deacon of the Milanese church, and the biographer of its great bishop.^z The matter was examined by

A.D. 412. a synod, before which Cœlestius was accused of holding

—that Adam would have died even if he had not sinned; that his sin did not injure any but himself; that infants are born in the same condition in which Adam originally was; that neither do all mankind die in Adam nor rise again in Christ; that infants, although unbaptised, have eternal life; that the law admitted to the kingdom of heaven even as the Gospel does; and that before our Lord's coming there were men without sin.^a He defended himself by saying that he allowed the necessity of infant-baptism;^b that the propositions generally, whether true or not, related to matters of speculation on

^s See Hieron. t. xi.; Mar. Merc. Commonit. ii. (Patrol. xlviii.); Aug. de Pecc. Meritis et Remiss. iii. 6; Præf. in t. x. 14. The authorship has been questioned, but the book is now generally acknowledged to be by Pelagius, although not free from alterations. Walch, iv. 550-1.

^t "Scotorum pultibus prægravatus," which Wall translates "having his belly filled, and his head bedulled, with Scotch porridge." (Hist. of Infant Baptism, i. 354, ed. Oxf. 1836; Hieron. Prolog. in Jerem. t. iv. 682.) But others apply the words to Pelagius, and suppose that Cœlestius was an Italian. See Pagi, vi.

600, 623; Walch, iv. 560; Schröckh, xiv. 364; Lanigan, i. 16; Quart. Rev. xciii. 19-20 (June, 1853).

^u Mar. Mercator, Lib. Subnotationum, Præf. 4.

^x "Ille apertior, iste occultior fuit; ille pertinacior, iste mendacior; vel certe ille liberior, hic astutior." De Pecc. Orig. 13.

^y Wiggers, i. 41.

^z Mar. Merc. Common. 1; Præf. in Aug. t. x. 18-9.

^a Aug. de Pecc. Orig. 26; Baron. 412. 20, seqq., with Pagi's notes; Tillem. xiii. 571-4.

^b See Aug. de Pecc. Mer. et Rem. 64.

which the Church had given no decision; and that consequently they could not be heretical. The council, however, condemned and excommunicated him, whereupon he appealed to the bishop of Rome. No attention was paid to this appeal—the first which is recorded as having been made to Rome from another province; and Cœlestius, without attempting to prosecute it, left Carthage for Ephesus.^c Augustine was now drawn into the controversy. Although he tells us that he had occasionally seen Pelagius while at Carthage, it would seem that the two had not held any discussion, as the Catholic bishops were then engrossed by preparations for their conference with the Donatists; nor had Augustine been present at the synod which condemned Cœlestius. But the progress of the new opinions soon drew his attention. He was induced to compose two tracts against them for the satisfaction of Count Marcellinus; and at the request of the bishop, Aurelius, he preached in opposition to them at Carthage.^d

In the mean time, Pelagius, expecting to find the East more favourable to his opinions than Africa, had taken up his abode in the Holy Land. He was at first on friendly terms with Jerome; but they soon disagreed, and Jerome became his vehement opponent.^e Augustine, little acquainted with the Greek writers, had spoken of the Pelagian opinions as novelties unexampled either among Catholics or heretics;^f but Jerome traced them to the hated school of Origen and Rufinus.^g

Soon after his settlement in Palestine, Pelagius received an application which may be regarded as an evidence of the high reputation which he had attained—an urgent request from the mother of Demetrias, that he would write to her daughter on the occasion of her professing virginity; and in consequence of this he

^a Aug. Ep. clvii. 22; Mar. Merc. Common. i. 2; Schröckh, xiv. 368-9; Wiggers, i. 189.

^d De Gestis Pelag. 25, 46; De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione; De Spiritu et Littera; Serm. 293-4; Præf. in t. x. 21-4.

^e Hieron. Ep. 133; Dialogi c. Pelagianos; Neander, iv. 311-2; Gieseler, I. ii. 109-110.

^f De Hæresibus, 88, init.; Wiggers, i. 404.

^g Ep. exxxiii. 3; In Jerem. l. iv. init. It has been said that both Pelagius and Cœlestius learned their doctrines from Rufinus, and that *he* had derived them from Theodore of Mopsuestia, who will be more particularly mentioned in the next chapter (Mar.

Merc. Præf. in Lib. Subnot.). Cœlestius himself mentions that he had heard "the holy presbyter Rufinus" deny original sin (ap. Aug. de Pecc. Orig. 3); but it does not follow that he had drawn his opinions from Rufinus, and the doubt is still stronger as to Pelagius. It is also questioned whether this Rufinus were the presbyter of Aquileia. Marius Mercator styles him "*natione Syrus*" (Præf. in Lib. Subnot. 2), which seems to indicate another Rufinus, although Wiggers (i. 38) interprets the words as alluding to the Aquileian's long residence in the east. See Præf. in Aug. x. 15; Pagi, vi. 507-9; 597-600; Tillem. xiii. 562, 569; Fleury, xxiii. 1; Walch, iv. 538-540; Schröckh, xiv. 336, 408; Gieseler, I. ii. 109.

addressed a letter to Demetrias. He tells her that it is his practice, in such matters, to begin by laying down what human nature can do, lest, from an insufficient conception of its powers, too low a standard of duty and exertion should be taken;^h for, he says, men are careless in proportion as they think meanly of themselves, and for this reason it is that Scripture so often endeavours to animate us by styling us sons of God.ⁱ The powers of man, like the faculties and instincts of all creatures, are the gift of God. Instead of thinking, with the vulgar, that the power of doing evil is a defect in man—instead of reproaching the Creator, as if He had made man evil—we ought rather to regard the enjoyment of free will as a special dignity and prerogative of our nature.^j He dwells on the virtues of those who had lived before the Saviour's coming, and declares the conscience, which approves or reproves our actions, to be, "so to speak, a sort of natural holiness in our souls."^k Pelagius shows an earnest zeal for practical religion, with a keen discernment of the deceits which might arise from an abuse of the doctrine of grace, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, from a reliance on formal exercises. But his peculiar tenets appear strongly; and perhaps the most remarkable feature in the letter is the evidence which it contains of the readiness with which the monastic idea of sanctity fell in with the errors which have become distinguished by the writer's name.

In July, 415, Pelagius was charged with heresy before John, bishop of Jerusalem, and a synod of his clergy, by Orosius, a young Spanish presbyter, who had lately come into the Holy Land with a recommendation from Augustine to Jerome.^l The accuser related the proceedings which had taken place at Carthage, and read a letter from Augustine. On this Pelagius asked, "What is Augustine to me?" but was rebuked for speaking so disrespectfully of a great bishop, by whom unity had been restored to the Church of Africa. John, however, was inclined to befriend him; he invited him, although a layman, to take his seat among the presbyters, and exerted himself to put a favourable construction on his words. When Pelagius was accused of holding that men could live without sin, the bishop said that there was scriptural warrant for the doctrine, and cited the instance of Zacharias and Elizabeth, with others equally irrelevant; and, on receiving from Pelagius an

^h Ep. ad Demetr. in Hieron. t. xi. 15, seqq. c. 2. (See p. 324.)

ⁱ Ib. 19.

^j Ep. 2-3. It will be seen that in representing the opinions of his oppo-

nents, Pelagius confounds between man's nature and the corruption of it.

^k Ib. 4, seqq.

^l Aug. Ep. clxvi. 2; Pagi, vii. 51; Tillem. xii. 326; xiii. 668.

acknowledgment that Divine grace was necessary in order to living without sin, his judges were satisfied.^m Pelagius, in truth, used the term *grace* in such a manner that his professions sounded orthodox; while he really meant by it only the outward means employed by God for instruction and encouragement in righteousness—not an inward work of the Holy Spirit, influencing the heart.ⁿ

The inquiry was carried on under the difficulty that Orosius could not speak Greek, that the members of the council understood no Latin, and that the interpreter was either incapable or unfaithful; while Pelagius, being acquainted with the languages and doctrinal peculiarities of both East and West, had an advantage over his accuser and his judges. Orosius therefore proposed that, as the question was one of Latin theology, and as the parties were Latins, it should be referred to the bishop of Rome; and to this John agreed—ordering Pelagius in the mean time to abstain from venting his opinions, and his opponents to abstain from molesting him.^o It need hardly be observed that the reference to Rome involved no acknowledgment of the later Roman pretensions, but was merely a resort from an incompetent to a competent tribunal—that of the highest bishop of the West.^p

In the end of the same year, two Gaulish bishops, Heros of Arles and Lazarus of Aix, brought an accusation against Pelagius before Eulogius, Metropolitan of Cæsarea, who thereupon ^{A.D. 415,} summoned a synod of fourteen bishops to Diospolis (the ^{December.} ancient Lydda).^q When, however, this assembly met, one of the accusers was sick, and the other excused himself on account of his companion's illness; so that, as Orosius did not again appear, Pelagius was left to make good his cause without opposition. He disavowed some of the opinions imputed to him, and explained others (or explained them away) in a manner which the council admitted as satisfactory. The acts of the Carthaginian synod were read; whereupon Pelagius declined entering into the question whether Cœlestius held the doctrines there censured, but declared

^m Aug. de Gestis Pel. 22; Oros. de Arbitrii Libertate, 3-6 (Patrol. xxxi.).

ⁿ See below, p. 421. Mr. Mozley suggests that in this he may have acted, not from duplicity, but from a real wish not to advance beyond his original statements. Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination, 60.

^o Oros. de Arb. Libert. 6.

^p Walch, iv. 591; Schröckh, xiv. 425.

^q For this synod, see Aug. de Gestis Pelagii, 2, seqq. It does not appear

for what purpose Heros and Lazarus had gone into Palestine. Many writers speak of them as at this time deposed; but such does not seem to have been the case. Zosimus of Rome, in 417, says that they had got their bishopricks irregularly; that they had *abdicated* them from a consciousness of this, and that he had *then* deposed them. Ep. ii. 4 (Patrol. xx. 651). Comp. Prosper. Chron. (ib. l. 590); Pagi, vii. 53; Tillem. xiii. 681, 720; Pref. in Aug. t. x. 40; Walch, iv. 598; Ellendorf, ii. 92-3.

that he himself had never held them.^r And, on being desired to anathematize the holders of these and other errors of which he had been suspected, he consented—professing, however, that he condemned them, not as heretics, but as fools.^s The council, little versed in Western questions, and desirous to act with moderation, acknowledged the orthodoxy of the accused. For this Jerome^t stigmatised it as a “miserable synod.” Augustine, however, spoke of it more respectfully, and expressed his satisfaction that, although from defective information it had allowed Pelagius to escape, it had yet condemned his errors.^u

Pelagius was much elated by the result of this inquiry. In a book which he sent forth on the Freedom of the Will,^v and in his letters, he referred triumphantly to his acquittal by the bishops of Palestine; and he sent Augustine some documents which gave a partial representation of the affair.^x Augustine, however, was soon after furnished with more complete information by Orosius, who returned to Africa, with a collection of papers on the subject; and

synods were held there, which condemned Pelagius and
A.D. 416.

Cœlestius. The African bishops wrote to Innocent, bishop of Rome, requesting that he would join in the sentence—apparently from a fear lest the Pelagian party at Rome should contrive to secure his favour by pressing on him the judgment of the Eastern council.^y An application of this kind could hardly fail to be welcome to Innocent, and he readily complied with the

request, taking occasion to accompany his consent with
Jan. 27, 417. much swelling language about the dignity of his see. But, however desirous the Africans might be to fortify themselves by the alliance of Rome, they throughout the affair treated with the Roman bishops on a footing of perfect equality.^z

Innocent died soon after, and was succeeded by Zosimus, who,

^r Aug. de Gest. Pel. 30.

^s Ib. 18.

^t Ep. cxliii. Some Pelagians, in their triumph, attacked the monasteries of Bethlehem, burnt a part of the buildings, killed a deacon, handled Eustochium and her niece, the younger Paula, roughly, and drove Jerome, who was then in extreme old age, to take refuge in a tower. (Aug. de G. Pel. 66; Innocent. ap. Hier. Epp. cxxxvi.–vii.) M. Guizot (i. 383) is inclined to question whether these outrages were the work of Pelagians.

^u De Gest. Pel. 45, 65; Præf. in t. x. 46; Baron. 315, with Pagi's notes; Tillem. xiii. 683–4; Walch, iv. 609–614;

Schröckh, xiv. 435–444; Neand. vi. 317. Marius Mercator says that Pelagius was condemned by a synod under Theodotus, bishop of Antioch (Common. iii. 5), which Garnier would date in 417 (Patrol. xlviii. 344). But, as Wiggers observes, if such a synod was really held, Augustine would hardly have failed to mention it. i. 326.

^v Aug. Ep. clxxxvi. 34.

^x Præf. in t. x. 47; De Gestis Pel. 1, 54, 57.

^y Aug. Epp. clxxv.–vii.; Tillem. xiii. 635–8, 690–2; Walch, iv. 615–625.

^z Innoc. ap. Aug. Epp. clxxxi.–iii.; Tillem. xiii. 701–2; Neander, iv. 319–320.

as being a Greek,^a was disposed to look favourably on the suspected teachers. Cœlestius, who had been ordained at Ephesus, appeared again at Rome, where he made a profession of orthodoxy, and requested that his case might be once more examined, declaring that any speculations which he might have vented did not concern the faith.^b About the same time Zosimus received two letters addressed to his predecessor—the one, in favour of Pelagius, from Praylius, who had lately succeeded to the bishoprick of Jerusalem; the other from Pelagius himself, artfully vindicating his orthodoxy and stating his belief.^c By these letters, and by the personal communications of Cœlestius, Zosimus was won over, and, after having held a council, at which Cœlestius disavowed all doctrines which the Apostolic See had condemned,^d he wrote a letter of reproof to the Africans. He blamed them for having too readily listened to charges against men whose life had always been correct, and for having exceeded the bounds of theological determination in their synods; he spoke strongly against the characters of Heros and Lazarus, whom he declared to be deposed from their sees;^e he stated that Cœlestius made frequent mention of grace; and he required that either the accusers should appear at Rome within two months, or the charges against Pelagius and Cœlestius should be abandoned.^f Paulinus, the original accuser, refused to obey this summons; Aurelius, with two synods (the second consisting of two hundred and fourteen bishops), replied that the condemnation which they had passed must stand until the objects of it should have clearly retracted their errors; they asserted their independence of Rome; and a “plenary” African synod, of more than two hundred bishops, passed nine canons, which were afterwards generally accepted throughout the Church, and came to be regarded as the most important bulwark against Pelagianism.^g These canons the council forwarded to Rome, telling Zosimus that he himself had been hasty in his

^a Baron. 417. 17, and Pagi's note.

^b Cœlest. ap. Mar. Merc. Patrol. xlviii. 498.

^c Ib. 488, seqq.; Aug. de Pecc. Orig. ii. 19; Walch, iv. 639, 640.

^d Aug. de Pecc. Orig. 19, 24; ad Bonif. ii. 5.

^e Historians speak favourably of the two bishops: the displeasure of Zosimus against them is ascribed by some to the influence of Cœlestius, and by others to the misrepresentations of Proculus, who had supplanted Heros in the see of Arles. There were then great contests among

the bishops of Gaul as to precedence and jurisdiction. See Prosper. Chron. A.D. 415; Baron. 417. 23; Pagi, vii. 103; Garnier, n. in Mar. Merc. Common. i. 5; Tillem. x. 692; Hist. Litt. ii. 147-152; Schröckh, viii. 447-452.

^f Ep. ii. (Patrol. xx.); Præf. in Aug. t. x. c. 15. Baronius (417. 39) is amusing on the subject of the Pope receiving Cœlestius.

^g Aug. t. x. 63-8; 1723-30; Tillem. xiii. 730; Walch, iv. 655, 660; Schröckh, xv. 25-7.

credulity, and exposing the artifices by which Cœlestius had disguised his errors.^h From this time Augustine spoke of the Pelagians no longer as brethren, but as heretics.ⁱ

The civil power had now mixed in the controversy, probably at the solicitation of the Africans. An imperial rescript was issued, April 30, 418, by which, after a strong denunciation of Pelagius and Cœlestius, it was ordered that, if at Rome, they should be expelled; that persons suspected of holding their opinions should be carried before the magistrates, and, in case of conviction, should be banished.^k Zosimus, pressed by the Court and by the anti-Pelagian party in his own city, found it expedient to change his tone. He professed an intention of re-examining the matter, and cited Cœlestius to appear before a council; whereupon Cœlestius fled from Rome.^l Zosimus then condemned the two heresiarchs, declaring that they might be re-admitted to the Church as penitents on anathematizing the doctrines imputed to them, but that otherwise they were absolutely and for ever excluded; he issued a circular letter (*tractoria*), adopting the African decisions, and required that this document should be subscribed by all bishops as the test of orthodoxy.^m

Nineteen Italian bishops refused, and were deposed.ⁿ The most noted of them was Julian, of Eclanum, a small town near Beneventum, who from this time became the leading controversialist on the Pelagian side. He was son of a bishop named Memorius, who was on terms of friendship with Augustine;^o he had married Ia, the daughter of a bishop, and the union had been graced with an epithalamium by Paulinus of Nola;^p and it was perhaps before his deposition that he obtained reputation and influence by giving all that he possessed to the poor during a

^h Aug. ad Bonif. ii. 5; Prosper. c. Collatorem, v. 3; Tillem. xiii. 730-1.

ⁱ Wiggers, i. 220.

^k Aug. x. 1726. Baronius (418. 19, 23) and other zealous Romanists attempt, very improbably, to maintain that this rescript was solicited by Zosimus. It was earlier than the "plenary" African synod of 418, but was probably the result of an application from another African synod, held in the beginning of that year. See Pagi, vii. 117; Tillem. xiii. 743-4; Walch, iv. 660, 670; Wiggers, i. 212; Gieseler, I. ii. 112.

^l Mar. Merc. Comm. i. 5.

^m The existing fragments of the circular letter are in Patrol. xx. 693-5.

For the title *tractoria*, see Garnier, in Mar. Merc. Common. iii. 1. On the perplexities caused to Romish writers by the behaviour of Zosimus, see Schröckh, xv. 34-6. He remarks that neither the Africans nor the emperor show any idea of Roman supremacy.

ⁿ A paper supposed by Garnier and others to be their profession of faith (Patrol. xlviii. p. 509) is wrongly ascribed to them. See Schönemann, ib. xxi. 1169. Some of them soon after sued for restoration. See Mar. Merc. Common. iii. 1.

^o See Aug. Ep. 101; c. Julian. Pelag. i. 12; Mar. Merc. Lib. Subnot. iv. 4; Præf. in Opus Imperf. t. x. 10, 35.

^p Poëma 25 (Patrol. lxi.).

famine.^q Julian is described as a man of learning and acuteness, but too confident, and of endless diffuseness and pertinacity as a writer.^r The founders of the heresy, wishing to remain within the Catholic communion, had studied to veil their errors under plausible language, and to represent the points in question as belonging not to theology but to philosophy. But Julian, with an impetuosity which Augustine ascribes to youth,^s disdained to follow such courses: he accused his own party of cowardice; he taxed the Catholics with Manichæism;^t he refused to accept any doctrine as Scriptural which did not agree with his own views of reason,^u and declared that the very essence of Christianity was at stake,—that the God of the *Traducianists*^x (as he styled those who held that sin was derived by inheritance) was not the God of the Gospel, inasmuch as the character ascribed to him was inconsistent with the Divine attribute of justice.^y

The Pelagians attempted to procure an examination of their case by a General Council; whereupon Augustine told them that the matter had already been sufficiently investigated, and that the cry for a General Council was only a proof of their self-importance.^z They repeatedly endeavoured to obtain a reversal of the Roman decisions; they applied for a recognition at Constantinople, Ephesus, Thessalonica, and elsewhere, and endeavoured to bespeak the sympathy of the Greeks by representing the Catholics as Manichæans.^a But their exertions were all in vain; both ecclesiastical judgments and edicts of the secular power were directed against them.^b Theodore, bishop of Mopsuestia—although he has

^q The authority for this act is Gennadius, *De Script. Eccles.* 45 (*Patrol.* lviii.); but he does not mark the time, and some writers (as Dean Milman, *Lat. Christ.* i. 128) place it shortly before Julian's death. See the preface to *Opus Imperf.* col. 1040.

^r Mar. Merc. *Præf. in Lib. Subnot.*; Baron. 419. 4, seqq., with Pagi's notes; Tillem. xiii. 750-2, 814, 821; Walch, iv. 702-4; Schröckh, xv. 37-9.

^s C. Jul. i. 34-5.

^t Aug. ad Bonif. i. 4; *De Nuptiis et Concup.* ii. 9; C. Julian, i. 36, seqq.; *Opus Imperf.* i. 85-96; vi. 14, etc.

^u Jul. ap. Aug. Op. Imp. ii. 53; iv. 136; vi. 41.

^x A question as old as Origen and Tertullian—whether souls were derived by *traduction* or created—was revived by the controversy. Augustine, however, was not really a *Traducianist*,

as his opponents said; for, although he inclined to that view (Wiggers, i. 149, 348-353) he would not pronounce on the question. *Epp.* cxliii., clxvi.; *De Pecc. Merit. et Rem.* ii. 59; *De Anima et ejus Origine*, i., iv.; *Nat. Alex.* ix. 256; Gieseler, vi. 336, 345; Neand. iv. 352; Ritter, vi. 369.

^y Jul. ap. Aug. Op. Imperf. i. 27-32, 50; Neander, iv. 328-330, 336-7.

^z Ad Bonif. iv. 34.

^a Ib. ii. 1, 3. The Greek historians do not even notice the Pelagian controversies. Wiggers, i. 324.

^b Hard. i. 1231-4; Aug. t. x., Appendix; Ep. 201; Mar. Merc. *Comm.* i. 3; *Lib. Subnot.* iv. 4, 12, &c.; *Præf. in Aug. Op. Imp.* x. 1042; Pagi, vii. 231, seqq.; Tillem. xiii. 754-6; xiv. 154, 304-7, 353; Wiggers, i. 283-5, 328.

been regarded as even the originator of the heresy^c—although he had written against Augustine's views,^d and had sheltered Julian when banished from Italy,—is said to have taken the lead in anathematizing the Pelagian tenets at a Cilician synod in 423.^e They were condemned by the General Council of Ephesus in 431^f—perhaps the more heartily because the party had been leniently treated by Nestorius, Bishop of Constantinople, who was the chief object of the Council's censure.^g

Pelagius himself disappears from history after the year 418, and, as he was far advanced in life, may be supposed to have died about that time. Nothing is known with certainty as to the end of Cœlestius and Julian.^h The founders of Pelagianism had made no attempt to form congregations separate from the Church; and although Julian, in the heat of his animosity, had declared against communicating with those whom he branded as Manichæans, he found it impossible to establish a communion of his own.ⁱ Pelagianism, therefore, never became the badge of a sect, although its adherents, when detected, were excluded from the orthodox communion.^k

The fundamental question between Pelagius and his opponents related to the idea of Free Will. By this term, Pelagius understood an unbiassed power of choosing between good and evil; and

^c M. Merc. Præf. in Lib. Subnot.; Photius, Biblioth. Cod. 177. See Dorner, ii. 38-9.

^d See Wiggers, i. 326.

^e Mar. Merc. Præf. in Symb. Theod. (Patrol. xlviii. 216). See Tillem. xiii. 569, 756-7, 817-9; Walch, iv. 683; Schröckh, xv. 92-3, 186. Perhaps Theodore, after having taken up Pelagianism as opposed to the new views set forth by Augustine, may have discovered that it differed widely from his own system. While Pelagianism allowed no place for a Redeemer, redemption was an essential point with Theodore; but he differed from the western teachers in viewing it rather as an exaltation than as a restoration. Neand. iv. 411, 416.

^f Hard. i. 1496.

^g Walch, iv. 684-8. Marius Mercator, a layman, probably from Africa, who was the chief opponent of the Pelagians at Constantinople, says that Nestorius, although himself sound as to the points in question, promised to restore Julian to communion and wrote a consolatory

letter to Cœlestius. Præf. in Nest. Tract. (Patrol. xlviii. 184). Wiggers supposes that the condemnation of Pelagius was decreed by the Orientals in consideration of the aid which Cœlestine of Rome gave them against Nestorius (i. 329-331). For the affinities and traces of connexion between the school of Antioch and the Pelagians, see Dorner, ii. 60-1. Tillemont says that, as the Pelagians had wished for a general council, they *no doubt* attended at Ephesus (xiv. 440); but there is no apparent ground for this inference.

^h Tillem. xiv. 757, 819; Walch, iv. 704; Schröckh, xv. 88.

ⁱ Prosper says that Julian endeavoured, by deceitful pretences of amendment, to "creep into the communion of the church" at Rome, under Xystus III. (A.D. 439, Jaffé), but was foiled by the influence of the Archdeacon Leo (afterwards the successor of Xystus). Chron. A.D. 443 (Patrol. xxvii. 721).

^k Præf. in Aug. x. 74; Walch, iv. 717.

such a faculty he maintained that man has, since the power of choice is essential to responsibility, and there can be no sin or guilt unless where there is voluntary evil.¹ Augustine, on the other hand, taught that freedom must be distinguished from the power of choice. God, he said, is free, although his nature excludes the possibility of his choosing or doing anything that is evil; hence a natural and necessary limitation to good is higher than a state of balance between good and evil; and such a balance cannot be, since the possibility of inclining to evil is a defect.^m Man is not free to choose between good and evil, but is governed either by grace or by sin. Our free will, without grace, can only do evil; the direction of the will to good must be God's gracious gift. Grace does not take away freedom, but works with the will, whose true freedom is the love of that which is good.ⁿ

Since Scripture undeniably refers all good to grace, Pelagius acknowledged this in words; but he understood the term *grace* in senses of his own, as meaning merely external gifts and benefits—the being and constitution of man; free-will itself; the call to everlasting happiness; the forgiveness of sins in baptism, apart from any influence on the after spiritual course; the knowledge of God's will, the Law and the Gospel, the example of the Saviour's life:^o or, if he sometimes used the word to signify the influence of the Holy Spirit on the soul, he did not represent this influence as necessary to the work of salvation, but only as rendering it easier.^p Pelagius laboured to exclude from the notion of grace anything that might be inconsistent with free-will; Augustine, everything that might savour of merit on the part of man. Distinguishing three stages in good,—the capacity, the will, and the performance,—Pelagius referred the first to God's gift, but regarded the others as within the power of human nature. ^qAugustine, on the contrary,

¹ Aug. de Pecc. Merit. et Rem. ii. 3; Cœlest. ap. Aug. de Perf. Just. 2, seqq.; Julian ap. Aug. Op. Imperf. i. 48.

^m De Nat. et Grat. 57; Op. Imperf. i. 100-4; v. 61; vi. 10. Cf. Anselm. Proslogion, 7. "Cum quis dicitur habere potentiam faciendi aut patiendi quod sibi non expedit, aut quod non debet, impotentia intelligitur per potentiam; quia quo plus habet hanc potentiam, eo adversitas et perversitas in illum sunt potentiores, et ille contra eas impotentior." (Patrol. clviii.)

ⁿ Aug. de Pecc. Merit. et Rem. ii. 7; de Sp. et Litt. 52; de Corrept. et Gratia, 31-2. Cf. Prosper. ad Ruf. 18;

Wiggers, i. 137; Neand. iv. 339-342; Ritter, v. 348-9; Mozley, 236, 249.

^o Aug. Epp. clxxvii. 4, 7, 8, 9; clxxix. 3; xciv. 8-9; de Nat. et Grat. xi. 53; de Gestis Pelag. 22, 30, 47; de Grat. Christi, 2, 8, 45; de Grat. et Lib. Arbit. 23-6; de Sp. et Litt. 32; ad Bonif. iv. 11; Julian ap. Aug. Op. Imperf. i. 94-5; Wiggers, i. 223, seqq.; Neand. iv. 357-8.

^p Pel. ap. Aug. de Grat. Christi, 8; Aug. de Hæres. 88 (t. viii. 48); Neand. iv. 354-5; Mozley, 102.

^q Aug. de Gratia Christi, 4, 17-9. He says that Phil. ii. 13 is directly against this. 6.

refused to admit the idea of a grace bestowed according to the previous receptivity of the soul ; because this, as he thought, placed the determination in human merit. Grace must, by its very name, be gratuitous ; the will to do good must be God's gift, as well as the capacity.^r

While Augustine held that the Fall had injured man both spiritually and physically ;^s that by communion with God Adam was enabled to live a higher life ; that he might have avoided sin, and, if he had not sinned, would have been raised to perfection without tasting of death, even as the angels, after having borne their probation in a lower degree of grace, were endowed with that higher measure of it which lifts above the possibility of falling and confers immortality.^t—Pelagius maintained that man's original constitution was mortal ; that Adam was originally placed as we are, and that we are not inferior to him.^u The passages in which St. Paul speaks of death as the punishment of sin, he interpreted as meaning spiritual death only.^x Augustine taught that in Adam all men sinned ;^y that, in punishment of the first sin, sin is transmitted by generation to all mankind ;^z that although, under the guidance of grace directing his free will, man might live without sin, this sinless life has never been actually realised.^a Pelagius, on the contrary, supposed that Adam's sin did not affect his posterity, except as an example ;^b that there is, indeed, a deterioration of the race through custom of sinning, even as an individual man becomes deteriorated by sinful habits ; that this comes to affect us like a nature, and has required occasional interpositions of the Divine mercy by revelations and otherwise ;^c but that man had all

^r Ep. exciv. 7 ; de Gest. Pel. 33, seqq. ; de Grat. Christi, i. 23-7, 34 ; ad Bonif. ii. 11, 15-21 ; de Gr. et Lib. Arb. 15 ; De Dono Persev. 54 ; Wiggers, i. 254, seqq. ; Ritter, vi. 342. This doctrine drew charges of fatalism on Augustine, against which he defends himself, Ad Bonif. ii. 10.

^s C. Jul. 111-113 ; Op. Imperf. vi. 7, 9 ; de Pecc. Mer. et Rem. i. 9-10, &c.

^t De Pecc. Mer. et Rem. i. 2, 4 ; de Civ. Dei, xiii. 1 ; Op. Imp. i. 102 ; de Corr. et Grat. 31-2.

^u Aug. de Hæres. 88 ; de Nat. et Grat. 23 ; de Corrupt. et Grat. 27-8 ; Op. Imp. iii. 156 ; Neand. iv. 342-3, 347 ; Mozley, 96.

^x De Pecc. Mer. et Rem. i. 2, seqq. ; Neand. iv. 350-1.

^y Much of his reasoning as to this was founded on the Latin translation of $\dot{\epsilon}\phi' \dot{\epsilon}$ in Rom. v. 12—"in quo," *i. e.* in

Adam (*e. g.* De Pecc. Mer. et Rem. i. 10). Pelagius rightly rendered the words "in eo quod," *i. e.* forasmuch as (Comment. in loc. ap. Hieron. xi. 668). Augustine's mistake, however, does not really vitiate his doctrine. See Olshausen, ed. 2, iii. 211.

^z De Nupt. et Concup. i. 25-7 ; de Civ. Dei, xiv. 1 ; Op. Imperf. i. 47. Julian argues that as St. Paul speaks of sin as having entered into the world by "one man," he must mean the imitation of Adam's example, since for a transmission by generation *two* would be necessary ! Ib. ii. 56.

^a De Pecc. Mer. et Rem. ii. 7, 8, 12, seqq. As Marcellinus was perplexed by this, Augustine wrote the treatise "De Spiritu et Littera" for his instruction. See the beginning of it.

^b De Pecc. Orig. 11-16.

^c Pelag. ad Demetriad. 8, ap. Hieron. xi. 23 ; Aug. Op. Imperf. i. 91.

along been able to live without sin; that some had in fact so lived;^d and that, if this had been possible under the earlier dispensations—nay, even in heathenism^e—the Gospel, which gives additional motives, higher rules of righteousness, and the light of a brighter Example, must much more enable us to do so.^f According to Pelagius, the saints of the Old Testament were justified by the Law. Augustine held that in spirit they belonged to the New Testament; that they were justified through faith in Christ, and through His grace which was bestowed on them by anticipation.^g Pelagius saw mainly in Christ nothing more than a teacher and a pattern.^h His death, although it was allowed to be efficacious for sinners,ⁱ could (it was supposed) confer no benefit on those who had no sin; the living union of the faithful with Him was an idea as foreign to the system as the union of the natural man with Adam in death.^k Pelagius, however, did not deviate from the doctrine of the Church with respect to the Saviour's Godhead.^l

The practice of Infant Baptism, which was by this time universally regarded as apostolical, was urged against Pelagius. His opponents argued from the baptismal rites—the exorcisms, the renunciation of the devil, the profession of belief in the remission of sins. Why, they asked, should infants be baptised with such ceremonies for the washing away of sin, if they do not bring sin into the world with them?^m The Pelagians answered that infants dying in

^d Ad Demetr. 5-6; Aug. de Nat. et Gr. 42. Abel, for example—as to whom the argument was this—that if he had sinned, in a time when there were so few persons for Scripture to speak of, it would not have failed to mention his sin (Pelag. ap. Aug. Ep. clxxix. 8; de Nat. et Gr. 44). Augustine's words as to the Blessed Virgin are remarkable:—"Excepta itaque sancta virgine Maria, de qua propter honorem Domini nullam prorsus, cum de peccatis agitur, haberi volo questionem: (unde enim scimus quid ei plus gratiæ collatum fuerit ad vincendum omni ex parte peccatum, quæ concipere et parere meruit, quem constat nullum habuisse peccatum?) hac ergo virgine excepta," &c. (De Nat. et Grat. 42). It is evident that Augustine, in speaking thus, does not give a precedent for the later Romish doctrine on the subject; and elsewhere (*e. g.* De Perf. Justitiæ, 44) he asserts that every human being, without exception, has sinned.

^e Ad Demetriad. 3, 8; Aug. de Grat. Christi, 31, 42; de Pecc. Orig. 29-30;

ad Bonif. i. 39. There is much discussion as to the heathen, whose virtues Augustine will not allow to be real, *e. g.* Cont. Julian. i. iv.

^f Pel. ap. Aug. de Grat. Christi, 33; Neander, iv. 306-7, 353.

^g Ad Bonif. iii. 6, seqq.

^h Aug. de Nat. et Grat. 47.

ⁱ Pel. in Rom. v. 5, ap. Hieron. xi. 667; Aug. c. Julian. vi. 4; Wiggers, i. 316.

^k Neand. iv. 360-1.

^l See his profession of faith in Mar. Merc. col. 489. Leporius, however, a Gaulish monk, who is styled a Pelagian, appears to have held something like Ebionite opinions. Both as to the person of the Redeemer and as to the doctrine of grace, he was convinced by Augustine. Cassian de Incarn. i. 3-8; Lepor. in Patrol. xxxi. 1215, seqq.; Baron. 420. 12, with Pagi's notes; Tilem. xiii. 879-892; Neander, iv. 332-3.

^m Aug. de Pecc. Mer. et Rem. i. 63; de Nupt. et Concup. i. 22; ii. 33, 50; c. Jul. vi. 10, seqq.; Op. Imperf. i. 56-60.

their natural state would attain "eternal life," which they supposed to be open to all, whether baptised or not; but that baptism was necessary for the higher blessedness of entrance into "the kingdom of heaven," which is the especial privilege of the Gospel;" that, as baptism was for all the admission to the fulness of the Christian blessings, the baptismal remission of sins must, in the case of infants, have a view to their future life.^o Augustine taught that infants dying without baptism must fall under condemnation. As to the nature of this, however, he did not venture to pronounce, and his language respecting it varies; sometimes he expresses a belief that their state would be preferable to non-existence, but at other times, his views are more severe.^p With respect to baptism, Augustine held that it conveys forgiveness of all past sins whatever, whether original or actual; that by it we receive regeneration, adoption, and redemption; but that there yet remains in us a weakness against which the regenerate must struggle here through God's help, and which will not be done away with until that further "regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory." The doctrine of this remaining infirmity was represented by the Pelagians as disparaging the efficacy of the sacrament.^q

Pelagius supposed that God had furnished man naturally with all that is needful for living without sin and keeping the commandments, and that the use of these gifts depends on our own will; Augustine, that at every point man needs fresh supplies of Divine and supernatural aid.^r Pelagius understood justification to be merely the outward act of forgiveness; whereas Augustine saw in it also an inward purification through the power of grace.^s Grace, he held, does not constrain the will, but delivers it from bondage, and makes it truly free; he distinguished it into—(1.) the *preventing* grace, which gives the first motions towards goodness; (2.) the *operating*, which produces the free-will to good; (3.) the *co-operating*, which supports the will in its struggles, and enables it to carry its desire into act; and lastly, (4.) the *gift of perseverance*.^t

The existence of evil was a great difficulty which exercised the

^o Coel. ap. Mar. Merc. 503; Aug. de Pecc. Orig. 6, 21; c. Julian. iii. 8-9; de Hæres. 88; de Pecc. Mer. et Rem. i. 23.

^p See Wiggers, i. 72.

^q De Pecc. Mer. et Rem. i. 21, 27, 55 (where he denies the existence of any middle place for such infants); c. Jul. v. 44, &c. See Wall, i. 360; ii. 204;

Wiggers, i. 80; Neand. iv. 428-433; Mozley, 130, and note xviii.

^r Aug. ad Bonif. iii. 4-5; St. Matth. xix. 28.

^s De Pecc. Mer. et Rem. ii. 5; Neand. iv. 342-4.

^t Op. Imp. ii. 165; Wiggers, i. 152; Neand. iv. 362-3.

^u Neander, iv. 369-70.

mind of Augustine. He thought that, as everything must be from God, and as He can only will what is good, therefore evil is *nothing*—not, as in the Manichæan system, the opposite of good, but only the defect or privation of good, as darkness is the absence of light, or as silence is the absence of sound.^u It has, however, been remarked that the power which he ascribes to evil is hardly consistent with this idea of its merely neutral quality—unless, indeed, his terms be understood in a meaning which they do not naturally suggest;^x and some of his arguments on this subject must appear (to ordinary readers at least) to be little better than a play on words.^y

Augustine in one of his early works had laid down that predestination is grounded on foreknowledge—an opinion which had been commonly held in the Church.^z As his views on the subject of grace became developed, he had been led to teach a more absolute predestination;^a but it was not until the Pelagian controversy was far advanced that he set forth distinctly, and in connexion with the rest of his system, those doctrines as to predestination which have entered so largely into the controversies of later times. The occasion for his treating the subject was given by a report of serious dissensions which took place about the year 426 at Adu-rumetum, where some monks, on the ground (as they supposed) of one of Augustine's epistles,^b disturbed their brethren by denying the freedom of the will, and a future judgment according to works. On this Augustine wrote a letter in which he laid down the necessity of believing both in the Divine grace and in the freedom of the will. "If there be no grace of God," he asks, "how doth He save the world? if there be no free will, how doth He judge the world?"^c and he devoted two treatises^d to the examination of the points in question. In these books, he still maintained the freedom of man's will; but he held that this essential freedom was not inconsistent with the existence of an outward necessity controlling it in the prosecution of its desires. Our will, he said, can do that which God wills, and foresees that it will do; will, therefore, depends on the Divine fore-knowledge.^e God had from

^u C. Ep. Manich. 34, 44; C. Julian. i. 45; De Civ. Dei, xi. 22; xii. 7; Jul. Müller, Lehre v. d. Sünde, i. 397, ed. 3.

^x For this see Müller, i. 403-4.

^y Neander, iv. 290; Ritter, vi. 350-6, 365, 372-3; Müller, i. 395-6, 399-400.

^z Expos. Propos. ex Ep. ad Rom. 60 (t. iii.). Cf. Retract. I. xxiii. 2. The date was about 394.

^a Lib. 1. ad Simplicianum (t. vi.),

A.D. 397. See De Dono Persev. 55; Wiggers, i. 287; Mozley, 134.

^b Ep. 194.

^c "De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio;" "De Correptione et Gratia."

^d Ep. ccxiv. 2. Epp. 215-6 relate to the same affair.

^e Ritter, vi. 343-5. Wiggers (i. 136) and Neander (iv. 291) say that there was a self-deception in his continuing

eternity determined to rescue some of mankind from the misery brought on us by sin. The number of these is fixed, so that it can neither be increased nor diminished; even before they have a being, they are the children of God; if they deviate from the right way, they are brought back to it; they cannot perish.^f As He, being almighty, *might* save all, and as many are not saved, it follows that He does not will the salvation of all—a tenet which Augustine laboriously tried to reconcile with St. Paul's declaration that God "will have all men to be saved and to come unto the knowledge of the truth" (1 Tim. ii. 4).^g The elect are supplied with all gifts which are requisite for bringing them to salvation, and grace works *irresistibly* in them.^h The ground of their election is inscrutable—resting on the secret counsel of God.ⁱ He does not predestine any to destruction; for his predestination regards such things only as He himself works, whereas sin is not his work;^k but He knows who are not chosen and will not be saved. These perish either through unforgiven original sin or through actual transgression.^l That they have no portion in Christ is no ground for impugning the Divine justice: for, if God do not give grace to all, He is not bound to give it to any; even among men, a creditor may forgive debts to some and not to others.^m "By giving to some that which they do not deserve, God has willed that his grace shall be truly gratuitous, and therefore real; by not giving to all, he shows what all deserve. He is good in benefiting the certain number, and just in punishing the rest. He is both good in all cases, since it is good when that which is due is paid; and just in all, since it is just when that which is not due is given, without wrong to any one."ⁿ Those who are lost deserve their condemnation, because they have rejected grace, either in their own persons or in that of the common father.^o Persons who are not of the elect may be baptised, and may for a time live piously, so that in the sight of men they are God's children; but they are never such in God's sight, since He foresees their end. If they go on well for a time, they are not removed from the world

to profess a belief in the freedom of the will.

^f De Corrept. et Gr. 13, 20, 23, 39; Ep. clxxxvi. 25; clxix. 4.

^g De Corr. et Gr. 47; De Præd. Sanct. 14. Other attempts of the same kind are collected by Wiggers, i. 365; Gieseler, I. ii. 122-3; Ritter, vi. 390-1.

^h De Corr. et Gr. 13.

ⁱ De Corr. et Gr. 17; De Præd. Sanct. 16; Neand. iv. 298; Gieseler, I.

ii. 120; Mozley, 148-9.

^k Op. Imperf. i. 121; Müller, i. 352.

^l De Corr. et Gr. 42. See Wiggers, i. 301, seqq.; and as to the difference between Augustine and Calvin on this point, 304-6.

^m Ep. xciv. 2-3; Ad Bonif. ii. 12.

ⁿ De Dono Perseverantiæ, 28-9; cf. De Corr. et Grat. 28.

^o De Corr. et Gr. 42.

until, lacking the gift of perseverance, they have fallen away. That God gives to some faith, hope, charity, but not perseverance, is astonishing; but it is not so much so as that, among the children of religious parents, He brings some to his kingdom by baptism, while others, dying unbaptised, are shut out; nor is it less wonderful that some perish through not having heard the Gospel—for “faith cometh by hearing”—than that others perish through not having received the gift of perseverance. And, since worldly gifts are variously bestowed, why should it not be so with this gift also?^p There are, however, differences of degree in the condemnation of those who are not elect; thus, although those who have never heard the Gospel will not, on account of their ignorance, escape the eternal fire, their punishment will probably be less than that of sinners who have wilfully rejected knowledge.^q

In this system there was much of a new and startling character—the doctrines of absolute predestination, of irresistible grace, of the limitation of Christ’s benefits to the subjects of an arbitrary election.^r Augustine himself was able to look on these doctrines as encouragements to trust in God; he exhorted others to do the same, and teachers to set them forth in that light, without questioning as to the election of individuals, or driving any to despair through the apprehension of being hopelessly reprobate.^s But we cannot wonder that they were regarded with alarm by many, both on account of the novelties of the theory and for the sake of practical consequences.^t

A middle party arose, which is known by the name of Semi-pelagian, originally given to it by the schoolmen of the middle ages.^u Its leader, Cassian of Marseilles, was a person of considerable note and influence. He is described as a Scythian^{*}—a term which has been variously interpreted. He had been trained

^p De Corr. et Grat. 11, 16, 18, 19, 40; De Dono Persever. 21; Gieseler, I. ii. 122.

^q De Gr. et Lib. Arb. 5.

^r Wiggers, i. 448–453.

^s De Dono Persev. 57–62; Mosh. i. 304; Schröckh, xv. 127; Neander, iv. 372, 382.

^t Gieseler, vi. 355.

^u See Walch, v. 4–7; Schröckh, xv. 116; Wiggers, i. 446–7; ii. 4; Gieseler, I. ii. 130.

^{*} Gennadius, 61. Some suppose him

a native of some country bordering on the Euxine. See Alard. Gaz. Præf. in Cass. (Patrol. xlix. 31); Tillem. xiv. 157, 739; Dupin, iv. 14; Walch, v. 37–8; Neander, iv. 375. Others think that he is called a Scythian from a confusion between Scythia and the desert of Scetis (or, as Cassian himself calls it, Scythis), in which he long resided; and that he was really a native of the west—probably of Gaul. Pagi, vi. 460; Hist. Litt. ii. 215; Wiggers, ii. 9; Gfrörer, ii. 19–20.

in a monastery at Bethlehem, and, after a long residence among the monks of Egypt (as to whose manner of life his works^y are a principal source of information), had been ordained a deacon by St. Chrysostom, after whose banishment he was entrusted by the clergy of Constantinople with a mission to Innocent of Rome.^z The occasion and the date of his settlement at Marseilles are uncertain; he had founded there a monastery for each sex,^a and had been raised to the order of presbyter.^b Unlike Pelagius, whose opinions he strongly reprobated,^c Cassian acknowledged that all men sinned in Adam;^d that all have both hereditary and actual sin;^e that we are naturally inclined to evil; and that for every good thing—the beginning, the continuance, and the ending—we need the aid of supernatural grace.^f But, although he maintained that grace is gratuitous—although he admitted that, in the infinite varieties of God's dealings with men, the first call to salvation sometimes proceeds from preventing grace, and takes effect even on the unwilling^g—he supposed that ordinarily the working of grace depends on the determination of man's own will; that God is the receiver of the willing, as well as the Saviour of the unwilling.^h As examples of those who are called without their own will, he referred to St. Matthew and St. Paul;ⁱ for proof that in some cases the will precedes the call, he alleged Zacchæus and the Penitent Thief,—as to whom he made the obvious mistake of regarding the visible part of their story as if it were the whole.^k He held that God furnishes man's nature with the seeds of virtue, although grace be needful to develop them;^l that Christ died for all men, and grace is offered to all;^m that there is a twofold predestination—the *general*, by which God wills the salvation of all men, and the *special*, by which He

^y "De Cœnobiorum Institutis;" "Collationes."

^z Chrys. t. iii. 523; Pallad. V. Chrys. ib. xiii. 11.

^a One of these, the abbey of St. Victor (or at least its church) still exists. Hist. Litt. ii. 35; Murray's Handbook of France.

^b Cass. de Incarnat. vii. 31; Gennad. 61; Wiggers, ii. 14-5; Tillem. xiv. 157.

^c E. g. De Incarn. i. 3; v. 2.

^d Collat. xxiii. 11.

^e Ib. 16, seqq.

^f Ib. xiii. 3, 6; De Cœnob. Inst. xii. 18.

^g Collat. xiii. 13-18. See Wiggers, ii. 91.

^h Prosper ap. Aug. Ep. ccxxv. 6.

See Collat. iii. 12-22; xiii. 8-18; Aug. de Præd. SS. 2; Tillem. xiii. 915-8; Walch, v. 177; Guizot, i. 385.

ⁱ Collat. xiii. 11.

^k Ib. xiii. 13. See Prosper c. Collatorem, vii. 3; Wiggers, ii. 110; Neander, iv. 377-8.

^l Collat. xiii. 12. "Undecavendum est, ne ita ad Dominum omnia sanctorum merita referamus, ut nihil nisi id quod malum atque perversum est humanæ ascribamur naturæ." The expression as to "seeds of virtue" is found in St. Chrysostom:—ὁρᾷς ὅτι πρὸς τὴν ἀρετὴν ἔχομεν ἀπὸ τῆς φύσεως σπέρματα; τὰ δὲ τῆς κακίας παρὰ φύσιν ἑστίν. Hom. 2 in Ep. ad Ephes. p. 120, ed. Field.

^m Prosp. ap. Aug. Ep. ccxxv. 6; Walch, v. 160-1.

determines the salvation of those as to whom He foresees that they will make a right use of grace and will persevere;ⁿ that the notion of an *irrespective* predestination is to be rejected, as destructive of all motive to exertion, alike in the elect and in the reprobate, and as implying the Gnostic error, that there are naturally distinct species of men;^o and that, in any case, predestination ought not to be popularly taught, inasmuch as the teaching of it might be mischievous, whereas the omission of the doctrine could do no harm.^p Faith and good works (it was said), although they do not deserve grace, are motives to the bestowal of it. Grace must work with our own will and endeavour; it may be lost, and is to be retained by man's free will—not by a gift of perseverance.^q God's purpose and calling, according to Cassian, bring men by baptism to salvation; yet the benefits of the Saviour's death extend to persons who in this life were never made members of Him—their readiness to believe being discerned by God, and reckoned to their credit. So children who die in infancy are dealt with according to God's foreknowledge of what they would have become if they had been allowed to live longer: those who would have used grace rightly are brought by baptism to salvation; the others die unbaptized.^r

These opinions found much favour in the south of Gaul, and reports of their progress were sent by two laymen, Prosper and Hilary,^s to Augustine,^t who thereupon wrote two treatises,^u which his Jansenist biographer declares to be nothing less than inspired.^x In these books he spoke of his opponents with high regard; he acknowledged the great and fundamental difference between them and the Pelagians; he treated them as being united with himself as to essentials, and expressed a trust that God would bring them to the fulness of a sound belief.^y

ⁿ Collat. xiii. 7; Prosp. ap. Aug. Ep. ccxxv. 3; Walch, v. 165, 178; Wiggers, ii. 122-3, 156, 181.

^o Prosp. ad Rufin. 4, 19; de Ingratis (Patrol. t. li.); ad Aug. Ep. ccxxv. 3; Schröckh, xv. 108-110; Neander, iv. 378.

^p Prosp. ap. Aug. Ep. ccxxv. 3; Hilar. ib. ccxxvi. 2, 5. This is answered by Augustine De Dono Persev. 38-40.

^q Cass. Collat. xiii. 11, 13, 18; Walch, v. 162-4.

^r Prosper ap. Aug. Ep. ccxxv. 4-5; Aug. de Prædest. SS. 24-5; Walch, v. 18-9, 166-7. Augustine speaks strongly against the doctrine of a judgment according to the foresight of things which are never realised. "Ita abhorret a

sensibus Christianis, aut prorsus humanis, ut id etiam refellere pudeat." De Dono Persev. 22; comp. 31.

^s Hist. Litt. ii. 10, 16, 209.

^t Aug. Epp. ccxxv.-vi. It seems to be a mistake to identify Augustine's correspondent with Hilary, afterwards bishop of Arles (for whom see below, c. x.). Not. in Ep. ccxxvi.; Vita Prosp. c. 23 (Patrol. li.); Wiggers, ii. 137; Ampère, ii. 23.

^u "De Prædestinatione Sanctorum," and "De Dono Perseverantiæ."

^x Tillem. xiii. 921.

^y De Præd. SS. 2; Tillem. xiii. 918; Walch, v. 32, 60-1; Schröckh, xv. 113, 130; Neander, iv. 378, 381.

The further history of Semipelagianism will come under our notice hereafter.^z

IV. During the last years of Augustine's life, Africa was overwhelmed by a barbaric invasion; and the author of the calamity was one with whom he had long been on terms of friendship, the imperial general, Count Boniface. Boniface had at one time been so deeply impressed by religious feelings that he would have entered a monastery, but for the dissuasions of Augustine and Alypius, who told him that he might do better by living Christianly in his military station, and exerting himself for the safety of his country.^a He afterwards, however, married a second wife, of Arian family; and, although she had professed Catholicism, it is said that the general, after entering into this connexion, declined both in faith and in morals.^b

Aëtius, the rival of Boniface in power and in military distinction, basely endeavoured to undermine him. By representing him as engaged in treasonable designs, he persuaded Placidia, the sister of Honorius, who governed in the name of her son, the young Valentinian, to recal the general from Africa; and at the same time, by telling Boniface that his ruin was intended, he induced him to disobey the summons. Boniface fell into the snare, raised the standard of revolt, and invited to his assistance the Vandals, who about the year 420 had established themselves in the south of Spain. A large body of them, under the command of Gieserich or Genseric, passed into Africa,^c where they were joined by the Moors, and by the fanatical Donatists—eager to take vengeance on the Catholics for many years of depression. The province was cruelly ravaged; the clergy in particular were marks for the enmity both of the Donatists and of the Arian invaders.^d

Boniface, who had been urged by Augustine to return to his allegiance, was deeply distressed by the savage proceedings of his allies, and, by explanations with the court, he discovered the treachery of Aëtius. Vainly imagining himself able to undo the mischief which he had caused, he requested the Vandals to withdraw from Africa, but was answered with derision, and found himself obliged to have recourse to arms as the only hope of delivering

^z See below, C. xiii.

^a Aug. Ep. clxxxix. ccxx. 3; Tillem. xiii. 712-4.

^b Aug. Ep. ccxx. 4; Tillem. xiii. 886.

^c Procop. de Bello Vandal. i. 3; Tillem. Emp. vi. 193; Gibbon, iii. 206-9.

^d Possid. 28; Victor Vitensis, i. 2, seqq. (Patrol. lviii.); Tillem. xiii. 899-900.

his country from the consequences of his weakness. But his forces were unequal to the enemy; and, after having been defeated in the field, he shut himself up in Hippo with the remains of his army.^e

Augustine was indefatigable in his labours during the invasion. He continued a long and elaborate treatise against the Pelagian Julian of Eclanum; he wrote other controversial works, and endeavoured by letters of advice and consolation to support the minds of his brethren in their trials. His pastoral cares were increased by the multitudes of all classes who had sought a refuge within the walls of Hippo; and soon after the Vandals had laid siege to the town he fell sick in consequence of his exertions. Wishing to secure his devotions from interruption, he directed that his friends should not be admitted to him, except at the times when medicine or food was administered. He desired that the penitential psalms should be hung up within his sight, and read them over and over with a profusion of tears. On the 28th of August, 430, he was taken to his rest.^f

^e Procop. ii. 3; Gibbon, iii. 212.

^f Tillem. xiii. 940-3. Hippo held out for fourteen months. Boniface had then got assistance from Italy and the East, but was again defeated by the Vandals. The people of Hippo escaped by sea. No bishop later than Augus-

tine is mentioned. In the seventh century the town was destroyed, and its materials were used for the building of Bona, at a distance of about two miles. Tillem. xiii. 945-6; Gibbon, iii. 214.

CHAPTER IX.

NESTORIANISM.

THE younger Theodosius was carefully educated under the care of his sister Pulcheria, and throughout his life was directed by her influence.^a His character was mild, but feeble. The nature of his piety may be inferred from a story which Theodoret^b tells in commendation of it. An impudent monk, after having repeatedly met with a refusal in some application to the emperor, excommunicated him. When meal-time arrived, Theodosius declared that he would not eat until he were absolved, and sent to beg that the bishop of Constantinople would desire the monk to take off his excommunication. The bishop answered that no heed ought to be paid to such a sentence; but Theodosius could not be at ease until the monk was found and was prevailed on to recall it. Pulcheria vowed virginity, and persuaded her three sisters to join in the vow; the life and occupations of the imperial family resembled those of a monastic society.^c

In 421 Pulcheria provided her brother with a consort, Athenais, the orphan daughter of an Athenian rhetorician.^d The empress took the name of Eudocia, and gave birth to a daughter, Eudoxia, who, in 437, was married to the emperor of the West, Valentinian the Third.^e The mother then obtained leave to visit the Holy Land, where she expended immense sums on churches, monasteries, and hospitals; and on returning to Constantinople, she brought with her some relics which were regarded as exceedingly precious.^f But soon after her return, she fell into disgrace, probably in consequence of having aspired to counteract the ascendancy of Pulcheria, and the remainder of her days was spent in penitential retirement at Jerusalem.^g

The state of the Christians in Persia drew the empire into a

^a Soc. vii. 22; Tillem. Emp. vi. 16; Gibbon, iii. 195.

^b v. 37.

^c Baron. 416. 36; Tillem. xv. 173-4; Gibbon, iii. 193.

^d Soc. vii. 21; Evagr. i. 20; Chron. Pasch. A.D. 420-1; Gibbon, iii. 196.

^e Soc. vii. 44; Evagr. i. 20; Tillem. Emp. vi. 75.

^f Soc. vii. 47; Evagr. i. 20.

^g Marcellin. A.D. 444 (Patrol. li.); Tillem. Emp. vi. 85; Pagi, vii. 602; viii. 53; Gibbon, iii. 198. Cf. Chron. Pasch. A.D. 444.

war with that country. Maruthas, a Mesopotamian bishop, after having laboured with much success among the Persians as a missionary,^h had been sent by Arcadius as an envoy to the king, Yezdegerd. While thus employed, he detected and exposed the arts by which the magi endeavoured to work on the superstitious feelings of the king; in consequence of his exertions, a complete liberty of religion was obtained for the Christians, and it was hoped that Yezdegerd himself would become a convert.ⁱ But this state of things was reversed through the indiscretion of a bishop named Abdas, who destroyed a temple of A.D. 414. the national religion. The king summoned him into his presence, mildly reproved him, and ordered him to restore the building, on pain of death and of retaliation on the Christian churches. As Abdas obstinately refused,^j the king found himself obliged to execute his threats; his disposition towards the Christians was changed, and many of them were put to death with frightful tortures. After an intermission during the last years of Yezdegerd, the persecution was renewed with greater violence under his successor, A.D. 420. Bairam or Vararanes. The frontiers of Persia were guarded, lest the Christians should escape; but some of them made their way to Constantinople, and represented the sufferings of their community to the emperor. Theodosius refused to give up the fugitives; and a war ensued, which, after some A.D. 422. years, was concluded in favour of the Romans.^k In the course of this war, Acacius, bishop of Amida, distinguished himself by a remarkable act of charity. Having learnt that seven thousand Persian captives were in his neighbourhood, he called his clergy together, and, reminding them that the God of Christians had no need of cups or dishes, as being Himself all-sufficient, he proposed to sell the gold and silver vessels of the church. With the price he ransomed the captives, and, after having entertained them until they were recovered from the effect of their privations, he sent them to the Persian king, as evidences of the real spirit of Christianity.^l

^h See Chrysost. Ep. xix. 5.

ⁱ Soc. vii. 8; Theod. v. 39; Baron. 420. 15, seqq.

^j Theodoret remarks, that the destruction of the temple was an error, since St. Paul did not use any such means against the idolatry of Athens; but that Abdas is to be admired for refusing to restore it, inasmuch as this would have been nothing less than sharing in the worship of fire (v. 39). Tillemont, as in the case of St. Am-

brose (see p. 272), endeavours to subdue his doubts by a reference to authority (xii. 357). See Bayle, art. *Abdas*, n. C., and Schröckh, vii. 366.

^k Soc. vii. 18-20; Theod. v. 39; Pagi, vii. 207; Tillem. Emp. vi. 36-9. Theodoret says that, at the time when he wrote, the persecution had lasted thirty years. His meaning is supposed to be that the Christians continued to suffer annoyance.

^l Soc. vii. 21.

By the death of Theodosius, in 450, Pulcheria became in her own right empress of the East. Feeling, however, that a female reign was a hazardous novelty, she bestowed her hand on a nominal husband, Marcian, a senator sixty years of age; and his conduct amply justified the choice.^m

For some years the empire had been kept in terror by Attila, king of the Huns, who extorted humiliating submissions and concessions from Theodosius. Marcian resolved to deal more boldly with this enemy; he refused the tribute which his predecessor had paid,ⁿ and Attila threatened vengeance. But before attempting to execute his purpose, the barbarian leader turned his arms against the empire of the West, where Aëtius, after having effected the ruin of his rival Boniface, had gained an entire ascendancy, and for twenty years sustained, with admirable vigour, the throne

of the feeble and depraved Valentinian. Attila, at A.D. 451.

the head of an immense host, had penetrated as far as Orleans, spreading desolation along his course,^o when Aëtius, who had been urged to action by Anianus, bishop of that city, advanced against him with a force composed of Romans and allies, of whom the most important were the Visigoths of southern Gaul, under Theodoric, the son of Alaric. The Huns, who had already entered Orleans, were driven off. Attila was defeated in the great battle of the plains of Châlons, and was compelled to retreat

across the Rhine.^p In the following year he invaded A.D. 452.

Italy; but the peninsula was saved from the apprehended ravages of his host by the mediation of Leo, bishop of Rome, who, with two high officers of the empire, waited on him in the neighbourhood of Mantua, and persuaded him to retire on receiving a large sum of money.^q A few months later, the sudden

death of the king, while employed in preparations for A.D. 453.

an attack on Marcian, and the consequent dissolution of the Hunnish monarchy, relieved both divisions of the empire from the fear with which he had inspired them.^r

In the year after the death of Attila, Valentinian, on a suspicion that Aëtius aimed at the crown, stabbed him at an interview in the palace; and, having treacherously violated the wife of a

^m Evagr. ii. 1.

ⁿ Tillem. Emp. vi. 95–112; Gibbon, iii. 225, seqq.; Amédée Thierry, Hist. d'Attila, i. 133 (Paris, 1856).

^o See Thierry, cc. v.–vi.

^p Jornandes, 37–40 (Patrol. lxi.); Greg. Turon. ii. 7; Tillem. Emp. vi.

149–162; Gibbon, iii. 254, 264–272.

^q Prosper, Chron. (Patrol. li. 603); Thierry, i. 217, seqq.

^r Jornand. 42, 49; Marcellinus, A.D. 454; Tillem. Emp. vi. 169–175; Mém. xv. 750; Gibbon, iii. 273–282; Thierry, i. 223–270.

senator named Maximus, he fell a victim to the vengeance of the husband, which was executed by two of the murdered general's adherents.^s

Mar. 16,
455.

On the death of Sisinnius, the successor of Atticus at Constantinople, a contest arose between the partisans of Philip of Side and Proclus. Both had been candidates in opposition to the late bishop; Proclus had since been ordained by Sisinnius for Cyzicum, but, as the people of that city denied the right of the bishop of Constantinople to appoint their pastor, he had been unable to get possession of the see. The court, with a view to allay the strife of parties, resolved that the vacancy should not be filled by any of the Constantinopolitan clergy, and made choice of Nestorius, a presbyter of Antioch.^t Nestorius had been a monk; he was of blameless life, had some character for learning, and was celebrated for his fluent and sonorous oratory; while he is charged with pride, vanity, and an eager desire of popularity, which led him (it is said) to make an ostentatious display of sanctity in his behaviour, and to affect an ambitious and unsubstantial style in preaching.^u In addition to his personal reputation, the circumstance that he came from the same Church with the revered Chrysostom rendered the nomination acceptable at Constantinople; and he was willingly elected by the clergy and people.^x

April, 428.

The new bishop entered on his office with a great display of zeal against heresy. Preaching in the cathedral on the day of his enthronement, he addressed the emperor—"Give me earth cleared of heretics, and I will give you the kingdom of heaven in return; aid me in subduing the heretics, and I will aid you to subdue the Persians!" The words were loudly applauded; but we are told that the wiser of the hearers conceived from them no favourable idea of the speaker's modesty and prudence.^y

His declaration of war was speedily followed up by deeds. Five days later he attacked a meeting-house of the Arians; the congregation in despair burnt it down; the flames reached to other buildings, and Nestorius got the name of "the Incendiary."^z He also persecuted other sectaries, and procured from the emperor a severe law against them.^a Socrates particularly notices his pro-

^s Prosper, *Patrol.* li. 604; Tiro Prosper, *ib.* 864; Tillem. *Emp.* vi. 251-3; Gibbon, iii. 283-4. According to Procopius (*De Bello Vandal.* i. 4, p. 187) and Marcellinus (A.D. 455) Maximus had been the instigator of the murder of Aëtius.

^t Soc. vii. 26, 29; Tillem. xiv. 283, 705.

^u Theodor. *Hær.* iv. 12.

^x Cassian. *de Incarn. Christi*, vii. 30; Walch, v. 319, 339-340.

^y Soc. vii. 29.

^z Soc. vii. 29; Tillem. xiv. 298.

^a May 30. *Cod. Theod.* XVI. v. 65.

ceedings against the Novatianists—a sect to which the historian himself inclined, and which Atticus had always spared, on the ground that they had suffered from the Arians in common with the Catholics, and that, as their separation was so ancient, their agreement in the doctrine of the Trinity was a valuable witness to the orthodoxy of the Church.^b

Nestorius himself was soon to fall under suspicion of heresy.

The schools of Alexandria and Antioch had been led, by their characteristic difference of tone, and by the necessity of opposing the several errors which more immediately pressed on each, to a diversity of view and expression on the subject of the Saviour's Incarnation.^c At Alexandria, where Arianism was the enemy to be combated, the Divinity was so strongly insisted on that language is found, even in the writings of Athanasius himself, which, at a later time, would have been a token of Eutychianism; as where he speaks of “not two natures, but one incarnate nature of God the Word.”^d Although the distinctness of the Godhead and the Manhood was recognised, the natures were viewed in their union; and as the Person in whom they met was one, the properties of one nature were, in speaking of Him, transferred to the other. Thus that which in strictness could belong only to his manhood, was predicated of Him as God, since the personality was in his Godhead before He assumed the nature of man; “God” (it was said) “was born, suffered, redeemed us with his blood.”^e In the West, a doctrine resembling that with which the name of Nestorius was afterwards connected, had been broached by a Gaulish presbyter, named Leporius, who also held questionable opinions as to original sin.^f Augustine, who succeeded in convincing him of his errors, illustrated the communication of properties in the Saviour by saying that we may speak of a “philosopher” as killed, dead, or buried, although it is in the body that such things befall the man, and not in that part of him to which the quality of philosopher belongs.^g

^b Soc. vii. 25.

^c Walch, v. 894.

^d Ath. de Incarn. Verbi, t. ii. p. 1. The phrase is quoted as from Athanasius by Cyril of Alexandria, in his letter to the empresses (t. V. ii. p. 48; see below, p. 441). On account of its appearing to favour Eutychianism, the genuineness or integrity of the tract has been questioned, as by Petavius, who ascribes it to Apollinarius (De Incarn. IV. vi. 5-7;

V. 15-7); but apparently without good reason. See Tillém. xiv. 534; Walch, v. 806-7, 884; Gieseler, I. ii. 133-4.

^e See Joh. Damasc. de Fide Orthod. iii. 4 (Opera, i. 209-10, ed. Le Quien, Paris, 1712); Petav. de Incarn. iv. 15-6; x. 1; Walch, v. 808; Neander, iv. 130; Wilberforce on the Incarnation, 193-4; Dorner, ii. 76, 135-7. ^f See p. 423.

^g Ep. clxix. 8; cf. Cassian. de Incarn. Christi, iv. 5-8; vi. 22; Dorner, ii. 89.

On the other hand, the Syrians—having to contend against Apollinarianism, with its denial of the Saviour's entire humanity, and its consequent fusion of the Godhead and the Manhood into a third something, different from either—were under a necessity of carefully distinguishing between the two natures. This method appears more scientifically correct than the other; but, in a school of rationalistic tendency (if the word may be used without conveying too strong an idea) it was likely to become dangerous. Diodore, afterwards Bishop of Tarsus, and Theodore, afterwards Bishop of Mopsuestia—the former Chrysostom's master, the latter his fellow-student and friend—were distinguished as teachers in this school, and introduced a system of explaining Scripture by the aid of history, criticism, and philology, whereas until their time commentators had been divided between the merely literal and the allegorical methods.^h Diodore and Theodore, therefore, may be regarded as the forerunners of modern interpretation; but it would seem that with the merits of their system they combined an inclination to lower and improperly to humanize the meaning of Holy Writ.ⁱ Theodore, for nearly fifty years, maintained the cause of the Church in controversy with various classes of assailants, and throughout his life his orthodoxy was regarded as unimpeachable. He was, however, afterwards represented by some as the father both of Nestorianism and of Pelagianism, and his memory became the subject of disputes which widely disturbed the Church.^k

^h Soz. viii. 2.

ⁱ See Neand. iii. 497-9; iv. 112, seqq.

^k Theodoret, v. 40; Pagi, vii. 232-3; Tillemont, xii. 442; Walch, v. 893; Schröckh, xviii. 266; Dörner, ii. 31-57. Gregory the Great says that the Apostolic see rejects Sozomen's history, because it speaks of Theodore as having continued to his death to be a great teacher of the Church; no one, therefore, says Gregory, can receive this book without contradicting the Fifth General Council. (Ep. vii. 34.) Theodore was bishop of Mopsuestia from 392 to 428 (Till. xii. 437). Most of his writings are now lost. He is said to have rejected some books of Scripture, and he denied the evangelical import of certain psalms which had been generally regarded as prophetic of the Messiah. (See Facund. Hermian. pro tribus Capitulis, iii. 6, Patol. lxvii.; Walch, viii. 14-5.) His criticisms on the Book of Job, which were quoted in the Fifth General Council (Collat. iv. t. V. 451-7, ed. Labbe), may be mentioned as a speci-

men of his manner.—The writer, he says, instead of relating the story of the patriarch in a simple and edifying way, is ambitious of displaying his pagan learning, and imitates the eloquence of the heathen tragedians. Theodore finds fault with the conduct of the plot and of the argument. The heathenish tendency he considers to be sufficiently apparent from the circumstance that Job's youngest daughter has [*in the Septuagint*] the pagan name of *Amalthea's horn*, which must have come from the author, since the patriarch knew nothing of the Greek mythology (!). His exposition of the Canticles is remarkable in a similar style. (See Schröckh, xv. 190, seqq.) German professors naturally recognise a kindred spirit in this commentator; but, although commentaries of such a kind may contain much that is valuable and instructive, the description of them is not such as to prepossess us in favour of the writer's orthodoxy. Theodoret, a warm admirer of Theodore, protests against his inter-

Nestorius has been described as a pupil of Theodore; but the description, if meant to imply a *personal* relation between the two, is probably incorrect.¹ Nor is much faith to be given to a story, that Nestorius, on his way to take possession of his see, visited the Bishop of Mopsuestia, who was then near his end, and that during this visit he imbibed the opinions which are associated with his name.^m

The first outbreak of the Nestorian controversy was on the occasion of a sermon, in which Anastasius—a presbyter
A.D. 428. who had accompanied the Bishop of Constantinople from Antioch, and was much in his confidence—attacked the use of the word *Theotokos* (*Bearer, or Mother of God*), as applied to the Blessed Virgin. Mary, he said, was human, and from man God cannot be born.ⁿ The term thus called in question had been used in the preceding century by Eusebius of Cæsarea, by Athanasius, the two Gregories, and others;^o the import of it was not to imply that the Blessed Virgin communicated the Divine nature to the Saviour, but to affirm the union of Godhead and Manhood in one Person, “because the Son of God took not to himself a man’s person, but the nature only of a man.”^p To the Syrians, however, the word appeared to involve the Apollinarian error of a confusion between the two natures; while the refusal of it by Anastasius suggested to his hearers at Constantinople the idea that the new bishop and his party maintained the mere humanity of the Redeemer—supposing the Spirit to have dwelt in Him only in the same manner as in the prophets.^q

Nestorius supported his friend by preaching a number of sermons,^r in which he brought forward quibbling and sophistical objections to the term *Theotokos*. If this expression were to be

pretation of the Psalms and Canticles. (Tillem. xv. 257-8; Dupin, iv. 91; Schröckh, xviii. 391-4.) Some of Theodore’s extant works are printed in the ‘Spicilegium Romanum,’ and in Mai’s ‘Collectio Nova.’ An edition was commenced by A. F. v. Wagnern, Berlin, 1834; but only the first volume has appeared.

¹ See Walch, v. 315. Petau infers that Nestorius was a hearer of Theodore, from a letter of John of Antioch, in Hard. i. 1329 (De Incarn. I. vii. 3).

^m Evagr. i. 2. See Tillem. xiv. 312; Walch, v. 886.

ⁿ Garner, in Mar. Merc. Patrol. xlviii. 703; Soc. vii. 32; Evagr. i. 2; Dorner,

ii. 62-3.

^o Euseb. Vita Const. iii. 43; Athan. Orat. iv. 32; Greg. Naz. Ep. 101 (t. ii. 85); Hard. i. 1400, seqq. See Petav. de Incarn. v. 15; Walch, v. 842-3; Newman on Athan. Orat. 420, 447. Gibbon (iv. 343) says that it came from the Arians; which Dr. Newman (on Ath. Orat. 292) shows to be a calumny. Hesychius of Jerusalem, who died in 343, had called David *θεοπάτωρ* (*father of God*). Gieseler, I. ii. 134.

^p Hooker, V. lii. 3.

^q Neander, iv. 126.

^r Marius Mercator gives translated summaries or extracts of thirteen. Patrol. xlviii.

allowed (he said), the heathens might be excused for assigning mothers to their deities ;^s the Blessed Virgin ought not to be styled *Theotokos*, but *Theodochos*, as having *received* God within her.^t Proclus, preaching in the cathedral on a festival to which the subject was appropriate, eloquently asserted the use of *Theotokos*,^u and his discourse was received with enthusiasm ; when Nestorius rose and objected to the preacher's doctrine as confounding the two natures.^v He declared, however, that he did not refuse to use the word *Theotokos*, provided that it were rightly explained, so as not to deify the Blessed Virgin herself ;^x but if she were to be styled *Mother of God*, the phrase must be balanced by also styling her *Mother of Man*—Mother of the tabernacle prepared by the Holy Spirit for the habitation of the Divine Word. He therefore proposed to speak of her as *Christotokos* (*Mother of Christ*)—a term which would denote her relation to Him who is both God and man.^y It may, he said, be affirmed that *Christ* has the attributes of either nature ; but not that *God* was born, or that *man* may be adored.^z

The excitement at Constantinople was immense. Nestorius continued to preach on the subject in dispute, and was often interrupted in his sermons.^a Eusebius, an advocate, who afterwards became Bishop of Dorylæum, charged him with the heresy of Paul of Samosata, and openly placarded a parallel between the two systems.^b The monks and most of the clergy were against the Bishop, and old jealousies connected with the election revived among them ; while the court supported him, and the majority of the people were as yet favourable to him, although many withdrew from his communion. He tells us that some of his opponents threatened to throw him into the sea ;^c and from the petition of some monks against him we learn that he himself made liberal use of deposition, whipping, banishment, and other forcible means against such of them as were amenable to his jurisdiction.^d

In the controversy which had thus arisen, as in the great controversy of the preceding century, the chief champion of orthodoxy was a Bishop of Alexandria ; but his character and policy remind

^s Serm. i. 6.

^t Ib. vii. 48.

^u The sermon is in Mar. Merc. col. 777.

^v Serm. iv. Some place this on Christmas-day, 428 ; others, on the Epiphany, or on the Annunciation, 429 ; but it is doubtful whether the festival of the Annunciation was yet instituted. See Garnier in Mar. Merc. 706, 776 ;

Augusti, iii. 43-61.

^x Serm. v. 4.

^y Serm. ii. col. 765 ; v. 1 ; xii. 9, seqq. ; Cassian. de Incarn. vii. 30 ; Soc. vii. 31 ; Theod. Hæres. iv. 12, p. 246.

^z See Serm. vii. ; Dupin, iv. 64.

^a E.g. M. Merc. col. 769.

^b Hard. i. 1271-4 ; Evagr. i. 9.

^c Serm. vii. 1.

^d Hard. i. 1337.

us less of Athanasius than of his own uncle and immediate predecessor Theophilus.^e

Cyril had passed five years among the monks of Nitria. His friend the abbot Isidore of Pelusium,^f a man of great piety and sincerity, tells him, in a letter written during this period, that, while he was praying in the desert, his heart was still fixed on the world.^g In 412, on the death of Theophilus, he was elected to the see of Alexandria after a contest with the archdeacon Timothy.^h In the administration of his office he was covetous and rapacious; he left at his death a large property, amassed from the revenues of the Church; he is even charged with simoniacal practices.ⁱ The earlier years of his episcopate were marked by many displays of violence. He acquired for his see an amount of secular power such as had not until then been attached to any bishoprick;^k he proceeded with great severity against the Novatianists; he expelled the Jews from Alexandria on account of a bloody tumult in the theatre; and in consequence of this act he quarrelled with the prefect, Orestes. A legion of monks from Nitria descended on the city, and attacked the prefect; one of them, who had hit him with a stone, was executed, and was thereupon canonized by Cyril as a martyr.^l The coolness with which the prefect regarded the bishop after these scenes was ascribed by the populace to the influence of Hypatia, a beautiful and learned virgin, whose lectures in philosophy drew admiring crowds to Alexandria; and in this

belief, a mob of parabolani and others, headed by a reader named Peter, attacked her in the street, dragged her from her chariot, hurried her into the cathedral church, and there barbarously murdered her.^m That Cyril had any share in the atrocity appears to be an unsupported calumny;ⁿ but the perpetrators were mostly officers of his church, and had unquestionably drawn encouragement from his earlier proceedings; and his character deservedly suffered in consequence of their outrage.^o

Cyril had accompanied his uncle in the expedition to Constantinople which proved so disastrous to Chrysostom. He held out

^a Tillemont mildly remarks, that although St. Cyril be a saint, much of his conduct is not saintly, xiv. 541.

^f See Schröckh, xvii. 520-9.

^g Ep. 25, ed. Paris, 1638.

^h Tillem. xiv. 268.

ⁱ Schröckh, xviii. 351; Neand. iv. 133.

^k Soc. vii. 2.

^l Soc. vii, 2, 13, 14.

^m Ib. 15.

ⁿ Schröckh, vii. 44-5. Gibbon assumes the truth of it as unquestioned, iv. 341.

^o It is supposed to have been in consequence of this murder that the number of the parabolani was reduced by order of the emperor. (See p. 300.) Fleury, xxxiii. 25.

longer than any other metropolitan against the insertion of Chrysostom's name in the diptychs of the Church, even when Atticus of Constantinople entreated him to yield for the sake of peace;^p nor, although he was at length persuaded to admit the name, and sometimes spoke respectfully of the great preacher's eloquence, did his feeling towards the memory of Chrysostom ever become cordial.^q And it is evident that the same desire to humble the newly-exalted see of Constantinople which had actuated Theophilus mixed also with Cyril's motives in his proceedings against Nestorius.^r

The bishop of Alexandria was drawn into the controversy by finding that copies of Nestorius' sermons had been circulated among the Egyptian monks, and that many of these had consequently abandoned the term *Theotokos*.^s He denounced the novelty in his Paschal letter of 430,^t and entered into a correspondence with Nestorius himself, in which both parties soon became angry,^u while he also opened a communication with some clergy and monks of Constantinople who were opposed to their archbishop.^x It would seem to have been in consequence of the irritation caused by Cyril's letters that Dorotheus, a bishop attached to Nestorius, on some occasion when the archbishop was seated on his throne, rose up in the cathedral, and loudly uttered an anathema against all who used the title *Theotokos*.^y Nestorius accused Cyril of having caused the disturbance which ensued at Constantinople.^z Some Alexandrians of worthless character, who were there, charged their bishop with various misdemeanours, which Nestorius threatened to bring before a general council. Cyril replied that he should rejoice if his affairs contributed towards the assembling of such a council, but that he would not allow his opponent to sit as one of his judges.^a He declared himself willing to sacrifice everything for the suppression of Nestorius' heresies;^b and, in order to detach the court from the opposite party, he addressed a treatise on the orthodox faith to Theodosius, and another to Pulcheria and Eudocia.^c

Nestorius had more than once applied to Cœlestine, bishop of Rome, for information as to the Pelagians, some of whose leaders

^p Cyrill. Epp. pp. 201-8 (Opera, t. V. p. ii.).

^q Baron. 412. 52-63; Tillem. xiv. 268; Schröckh, xviii. 318.

^r Walch, v. 423; Schröckh, xviii. 196.

^s Cyrill. ad Cœlestin. Epp. p. 38.

^t Ep. 1.

^u Hard. i. 1295-8.

^y Cyrill. Ep. p. 37; Walch, v. 427.

^z Ib. 20, 38.

^a Ib. 34-5.

^c Opera, t. V. ii. 1-180.

^b Ib. 2-5.

^b Ib. 36.

were then at Constantinople;^d but he had not received any answer. He now repeated his inquiries, and added some account of the new controversy which had arisen.^e Cyril also applied to Cœlestine, but more skilfully; for whereas Nestorius had addressed the Roman bishop as an equal, the bishop of Alexandria adopted a strain of deference, or rather subserviency, of which there had been no example on the part of any among his predecessors.^f His representation of Nestorius' opinions procured from Cœlestine and a

Aug. 430. Roman synod a condemnation of the bishop of Constantinople as a heretic, with a letter announcing to him that he should be deposed and excommunicated, unless within ten days after receiving it he should conform to the faith of Rome and Alexandria, and restore all whom he had deposed on account of the late disputes. Cyril was authorised to execute this sentence as plenipotentiary of the Roman bishop; and at the same time Cœlestine wrote to the Church of Constantinople, and to John, bishop of Antioch, denouncing the errors of Nestorius, and intimating the condemnation which was to be pronounced if the archbishop should persist in them.^g

Cyril also wrote to some Eastern bishops, giving his statement of the controversy. From Acacius of Berrhœa (who was now a hundred and ten years old), from John of Antioch, and others, he received answers disapproving of what had been said by Nestorius, and more especially by Dorotheus, but entreating him to avoid an open breach.^h John, in the name of several other bishops, wrote to Nestorius, expressing full confidence in his orthodoxy, and advising him not to insist on unnecessary scruples as to the disputed term; and, as Nestorius had professed his willingness to adhere to the doctrine of the fathers, and to admit the word *Theotokos* in a certain sense, the patriarch of Antioch flattered himself that peace would be easily restored.ⁱ

After some delay, Cyril forwarded the Roman letter to Nestorius, with one written in the name of an Alexandrian council,

^d See p. 420.

^e Hardouin, i. 1307-10; Tillem. xiv. 342-4.

^f Ep. 9; Walch, v. 433-4. The deacon who carried Cyril's letter was instructed not to deliver it unless Cœlestine had received a communication from Nestorius. (Hard. i. 1356; Walch, v. 393-5.) Although Cyril went far in flattering Cœlestine, the very extravagant language which is quoted as from him by Aquinas, and which was long

relied on by the advocates of the Roman supremacy, is certainly spurious. Dupin, iv. 44-5.

^g Hard. i. 1308-1326.

^h Cyril. Epp. pp. 42-65. Pagi (in Baron. 430. 10) says that Acacius was favourable to the opinions of Nestorius; but the only proof of this is that he endeavoured to give his language an orthodox construction.

ⁱ Hard. i. 1327-33.

which summoned the bishop of Constantinople to forswear his errors, and concluded with twelve anathemas, which it required him to subscribe.^k To these Nestorius replied by a like number of counter-anathemas, which, in their turn, were answered at far greater length by Marius Mercator, a zealous layman from the West, who was then resident at Constantinople,^l and had already made himself conspicuous by his energetic opposition to Pelagianism. Of the propositions thus put forth on each side, while some are really contradictory of each other, others, in words studiously contrasted, express different sides of the same truth. The leading object of Cyril is to assert the unity of the Saviour's person; that of Nestorius, to guard against a confusion of his natures. Cyril expressed the combination of natures by the term *Union*; Nestorius, by *Conjunction*.^m The Alexandrian anathemas produced a great commotion in the East, where they were regarded as doing away with the distinction of natures in the Saviour. John of Antioch wished that they should be generally condemned as Apollinarian;ⁿ treatises were written against them by Andrew, bishop of Samosata, and by Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus.^o

The last-named of these objectors was the most learned divine of whom the Eastern Church could in that age boast. He was born at Antioch about 390,^p and is supposed to have studied under Theodore of Mopsuestia, of whose writings he was certainly a diligent reader and a warm admirer.^q About the year 420 he was elected to fill the see of Cyrus,^r in the Euphratesian province, where he laboured with great activity and success to extirpate the heresies with which his diocese had been infested,—often even exposing his life to danger from the fury of the Marcionites and other sectaries, who held possession of entire villages.^s His influence over his clergy is attested by the fact that in five-and-twenty years not one of them had appeared before a secular tribunal.^t Nor was his care for his people limited to spiritual things; he devoted the whole of his income to their benefit, erected bridges,

^k Hardouin, i. 1282-94. On Cyril's views, see Dorner, ii. 64, 138.

^l Hard. i. 1297-1300; Mar. Merc. 909, seqq. (Patrol. xlviii.); Walch, v. 700-730.

^m ἔνωσις, union; συνάφεια, conjunction. Συνάφεια, however, had been used by Basil and Chrysostom, and is used by John Damascene. Petav. de Incarn. III. ii. 7. Walch says that it cannot be proved that Nestorius rejected ἔνωσις, although he preferred the other. v. 781-2.

ⁿ Hard. i. 1349; Theodoret, Ep. 112, p. 983.

^o Theodor. t. iv. 706, seqq.; Cyril. vi. 157, seqq. (in reply to the Orientals); 200, seqq. (in reply to Theodoret); Mar. Merc. 933, seqq.

^p Between 386 and 393. Schröckh, xviii. 356.

^q Ibid. 358.

^r Now Kars—a name which has become familiar to English ears through the siege of 1855.

^s Theod. Ep. 80.

^t Ib. 80-1.

baths, and other public buildings, and induced persons skilled in physic and other useful arts to settle at Cyrus.^u The variety of Theodoret's literary merits was extraordinary; it has been said of him that "he equally well sustains the character of a commentator, a theologian, a historian, a controversialist, an apologist, and a writer on practical religion."^v Throughout the differences of his time he was the most eminent leader on the Oriental side; but his moderation and fairness were ill appreciated amid the rage of party strife, and he suffered from the violence of opposite factions.^x

Finding himself beset by the patriarchs of Rome and Alexandria, Nestorius saw no other chance of escape from his difficulties than an appeal to a general council. Some of his opponents had already petitioned for such an assembly;^y and in November, 430, Theodosius, in his own name and in that of the western emperor, issued orders for the meeting of representatives of the whole church at Ephesus. The time appointed was the following Whitsuntide, and in the meanwhile things were to remain as they were, so that the execution of the Roman decree was suspended. Each metropolitan was to bring with him so many of his suffragans as he might think expedient—taking care that a number sufficient for the performance of the ordinary pastoral duties should be left.^z The citation addressed to Cyril was accompanied by a special letter from Theodosius, in which the patriarch was charged with pride, turbulence, assumption of rights which belonged to a general council alone, and with fondness for intruding into palaces, as if there were discord between relations, or as if he hoped to set them at variance.^a This last charge, which refers to the separate letter written by Cyril to Eudocia and Pulcheria, appears to indicate that

^u Theod. Epp. 79, 81, 115.

^v Dupin, iv. 85; comp. Schröckh, xviii. 355-6.

^x Dupin, iv. 82; Schrockh, xviii. 367.

^y Hard. i. 1340.

^z Hard. i. 1344-5. Baronius (t. v. p. 566, ed. Antv. 1658) and Bellarmine (De Conc. et Eccl. i. 13) say that, although the emperor called the council, it was by the pope's advice and with his concurrence. But Dupin (iv. 320) observes that the pope knew nothing of it; that he was cited in the same way as other bishops; and that the emperor seems to have wished to reform or invalidate his judgment. (Comp. Nat. Alex. ix. Dissert. vii. qu. 1; Tillem. xiv. 363,

759.) Rohrbacher does not think the matter worth disputing on the old ground. "Cette grande affaire allait se terminer ainsi d'une manière purement ecclésiastique, par la décision du pape, exécutée par le patriarche d'Alexandrie, sans que celui d'Antioche, ni aucun autre évêque, y trouvât à redire; cette voie était trop simple pour la cour de Constantinople. Il fallut à l'Empereur Théodose un concile œcuménique, lequel, après bien des longueurs et des dépenses, ne fera que ce qu'on allait faire sans frais, exécuter, et cela nécessairement, ainsi que le dira le concile même, la décision du pape!" (viii. 45-6.)

^a Hard. i. 1341-4.

the suspicion imputed to him was not without foundation.^b Of bishops below the degree of metropolitan, Augustine alone was honoured with an invitation by name;^c but, unhappily for the council, he had died some months before.

Nestorius arrived at Ephesus soon after Easter (April 19th), attended by sixteen bishops. Before Whitsuntide (June 7th), Cyril appeared at the head of fifty bishops, with a ^{A.D. 431.} large train of sailors and other disorderly persons.^d About forty bishops were with Memnon, metropolitan of Ephesus, a man of unscrupulous character, who had a special motive for taking part with Cyril against the patriarch of Constantinople, inasmuch as the independence of his own "apostolical" church was in danger from the neighbourhood of the new capital.^e The African Church was prevented by the Vandal invasion from sending any representative to the Council; but Capreolus, of Carthage, wrote a letter, entreating that the fathers would not countenance any novelty.^f Coelestine, of Rome, deputed two bishops and a presbyter to represent himself and "the whole Council of the West," with directions to guide themselves by Cyril's judgment, and to consult the dignity of the apostolic see by acting as judges, not as disputants. These, however, had not yet reached Ephesus.^g Candidian, count of the domestics, was commissioned by the emperor to keep order. In obedience to his instructions, he commanded that all monks and lay strangers should leave Ephesus, and that no bishop should under any pretence absent himself until the business of the Council should have been concluded.^h

About two hundred bishops were assembled, but John of Antioch had not yet appeared. The beginning of his journey had been delayed, partly by the difficulty of collecting his suffragans, who were unable to leave their homes until after the octave of Easter, and partly by disturbances in his city on account of a scarcity; and the state of the roads, flooded by heavy rains, had obliged him to travel slowly, with the loss of many horses by the way.ⁱ The bishops who were already at Ephesus, while waiting for the arrival of John and the Orientals, engaged in frequent informal discussions, which tended rather to exasperate than to heal their differences.^k Nestorius declared that his life was in danger from the ruffians of Cyril's train, and from the peasants who were at the

^b See Tillem. x. 176; Walch, v. 557; Schröckh, xviii. 257-8; Neand. iv. 142.

^c Hard. i. 1419; Tillem. xiv. 365.

^d Soz. vii. 34; Tillem. xiv. 377-8,

762.

^e Tillem. xiv. 762-3; Gieseler, I. ii.

188, 191.

^f Hard. i. 1419-22.

^g Hard. i. 1347; Tillem. xiv. 374-6, 761; Walch, v. 459-460.

^h Hard. i. 1346-8; Tillem. xiv. 380-2.

ⁱ Hard. i. 1460; Evagr. i. 3.

^k Cyrill. Epp. p. 84; Walch, v. 465-9.

beck of Memnon ; while the opposite party complained against the soldiers who acted as a guard to the bishop of Constantinople.¹

On the 21st of June, Cyril, who, in virtue of the dignity of his see, assumed the presidency of the Council,^m declared that he would wait no longer, although he had received a courteous letter from John, apologising for his delay, and stating that he was within a few days' journey of Ephesus.ⁿ Nestorius was cited to appear before the council next day ; he answered that he would attend when John should be present, or when summoned by Candidian.^o Theodoret and sixty-seven other bishops, of whom twenty-two were metropolitans, protested against proceeding to business without the presence of the Orientals.^p But the Council met on

June 22.

the following day, in the Church of St. Mary, where the Theotokos was believed to have been interred. Candidian attended, and, at the desire of the bishops, read his commission from the emperor. His request that four days might be allowed for the arrival of the Orientals was refused ; and as the commission restrained him from entering into questions of doctrine, he was—not without indignity, as he complains—obliged to leave the church, after protesting that anything which might be done in opposition to his directions should be of no effect.^q The bishops refused even to look at the memorial of their sixty-eight brethren.^r A second and a third citation were sent to Nestorius, but his guard prevented the delivery of them.^s

The council proceeded to the question for the consideration of which it had been summoned. After the recitation of the Nicene creed, Cyril's second letter to Nestorius was read, and the bishops severally expressed their high approval of it, as being conformable to the Nicene faith.^t The answer returned by Nestorius was then read ; whereupon many of the bishops spoke in condemnation of it, and the whole assembly joined in uttering anathemas against the writer and his doctrines.^u Other documents followed ; among them was Cyril's third letter to Nestorius—that containing the anathemas—which was received without any remark.^x By way

¹ Hard. i. 1437, 1455, 1460, 1464; Neand. iv. 154.

^m Baronius (431. 50) and Rohrbacher (viii. 54) assert that Cyril presided as legate of Coelestine. See, for the contrary, Dupin, iv. 320; Tillem. xiv. 393, 765-6; Fleury, xxv. 37; and comp. Nat. Alex. ix. Dissert. vii. qu. 2. Walch (v. 476) and Schröckh (xviii. 237) vehemently contend that, as the doctrine of Cyril's own anathemas was in question,

he ought, like Nestorius, to have appeared as a party, not as a judge.

ⁿ Hard. i. 1348; Evagr. i. 4.

^o Hard. i. 1357, 1457.

^p Ib. 1349-52. ^q Ib. 1351-4.

^r Tillem. xiv. 395; Walch, v. 479.

^s Hard. i. 1360-1, 1447.

^t Ib. 1364-88. ^u Ib. 1388-96.

^x Ib. 1396. The sanction of the council was afterwards constructively claimed for this letter. In the West,

of proof that Nestorius still adhered to his errors, reports were made as to language which he had used in conversation since coming to Ephesus: as that he had asked how he could give the name of God to a child two or three months old—a question which was understood as a denial of the Saviour's Godhead.^y A collection of extracts from earlier theologians was produced, in evidence of the true doctrine on the disputed points;^z and after it a number of passages from the writings of Nestorius were read amidst general disapprobation—the fathers stopping their ears at the occurrence of words which they considered blasphemous.^a A sentence of deposition against Nestorius was drawn up “in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ whom he hath blasphemed;” it was signed by a hundred and ninety-eight bishops, and, in token of the feelings which animated them, it was addressed to the patriarch as “a new Judas.”^b Cyril afterwards attempted to excuse the indecency and the glaring unfairness of these hasty proceedings by such pretences as that John of Antioch was not in earnest, that his delay was intentional, and that he was determined not to condemn one who had been promoted from among his own clergy. Perhaps the boldest of all the pleas was, that two Syrian metropolitans, who reached Ephesus on the day before the session, had answered some complaints of delay by expressing their patriarch's willingness that the council should be *opened* without waiting longer for him.^c

Candidian was astonished on the following morning to find what had been done. He tore down the placard in which the deposition of Nestorius was announced; he issued an edict declaring the proceedings of the council to be null and void; he sent their placard to the emperor, with a letter strongly reflecting on the irregularities of Cyril and his associates.^d Nestorius also wrote to Theodosius, begging that an impartial synod might be assembled for the examination of his case; that each metropolitan should bring with him only two bishops—a regulation which, from the arrangement of the Egyptian patriarchate, would have left Cyril almost unsupported;^e and that not only monks and clergy, but all

the anathemas were even supposed to be the work of the council. See Tillem. xiv. 358, 360, 397–8, 758; Walch, v. 484, 732–3; Gibbon, iv. 344.

^y Hard. i. 1397–9; Cyril. Epp. p. 84; Soz. vii. 34; Neand. iv. 158.

^z Hard. i. 1400–9.

^a Ib. 1409–20.

^b Ib. 1422–4.

^c Ib. 1505; Neand. iv. 156. Garnier says that John's excuses for his delay

appear to be good, but that it is better to suppose him in the wrong than to censure the opening of the great council as precipitate! Ap. Mar. Merc. Patrol. xlviii. 719.

^d Hard. i. 1452.

^e The bishop of Alexandria had originally been the only metropolitan in his patriarchate. By this time there were apparently some metropolitans under him (Tillemont says eight, xv.

such bishops as were not so summoned, should be kept at a distance from the place of meeting.^f

On the 27th of June, John of Antioch, with fourteen oriental bishops, reached Ephesus. As they approached the city, a deputation from the council met them, and reported the transactions which had taken place. The patriarch was filled with astonishment and indignation. Immediately on reaching his lodgings, he held a council of the bishops who had accompanied him, with twenty-nine others who joined them. Candidian appeared, gave his account of the late session, and withdrew. The bishops then proceeded to consider Cyril's conduct, and the anathemas which he had published; they pronounced him guilty of turbulence, and of reviving the Arian, Apollinarian, and Eunomian heresies; they sentenced him and Memnon to deposition, and declared the rest of the two hundred to be separated from their communion until they should join in condemning the anathemas.^g The deputies of Cyril's party endeavoured to communicate with John, but were insulted, beaten, and repulsed by the soldiers of his guard.^h On receiving the report of this, and apparently before the decrees of the Orientals had reached them, Cyril and his synod declared John to be excommunicate until he should give an explanation of his behaviour. The Orientals attempted to carry out their condemnation of Memnon by consecrating a bishop in his stead; but they were unable to gain entrance into a church for the purpose, and were beaten by a rabble of his adherents.ⁱ

Reports of the proceedings at Ephesus got into circulation, and produced in many quarters an impression unfavourable to Cyril. Isidore of Pelusium, with his usual frankness, wrote to beg that he would act with fairness and deliberation, telling him that he was charged with seeking to disguise his private enmity against Nestorius under the name of a zeal for Christ, and that parallels were drawn between his conduct and that of his uncle Theophilus.^k

The emperor, on receiving Candidian's letter, wrote to the bishops who had condemned Nestorius, blaming them for having proceeded irregularly and on motives of personal malice, and forbidding them to leave Ephesus until the affair should be rightly

529), although they seem not to have had the same amount of power or independence as metropolitans elsewhere. See Planck, i. 612; Döllinger, i. 201; Wiltsch, i. 180-1; note in Fleury, ii. 83; Neale's Holy Eastern Church, In-

trod. i. 112-3.

^f Hard. i. 1438-40.

^g Ib. 1447-58.

^h Ib. 1488; Evagr. i. 8.

ⁱ Hard. i. 1451-8; Evagr. i. 5.

^k Isid. Pelus. Epp. i. 310.

settled.¹ A reply was drawn up, in which they excused themselves for having acted without the presence of the Orientals, and begged that Candidian might be recalled as having shown partiality to their opponents, and that five of their number might be allowed to wait on the emperor.^m The acts of the council, revised by Cyril, perhaps not without some unfairness,ⁿ were annexed to this letter. But Candidian prevented the papers from reaching the court, and the ways were so closely watched that the council, in order to communicate with Constantinople, was obliged to intrust a letter to a beggar, who carried it in a hollow staff.^o The receipt of this missive produced a great agitation among Cyril's partisans. The monasteries of the capital poured forth their inmates, among whom the most conspicuous was Dalmatius, an abbot who for eight-and-forty years had been shut up within the walls of his retreat, refusing to leave it even when entreated by the emperor to take part in solemn processions on occasion of earthquakes. He was now warned by a heavenly voice to go forth, and proceeded to the palace at the head of an immense multitude, which filled the air with the chant of psalms. The abbots were admitted into the emperor's presence. Dalmatius showed the letter from Ephesus; he set forth the grievances of the orthodox party, and asked whether it were better to adhere to a single impious man or to six thousand bishops, dispersed throughout the world, but represented by their metropolitans and brethren at Ephesus. Theodosius was moved, and said that the council had only to send some of its members to state its case. Dalmatius in answer explained the constraint in which the bishops were held, and obtained from the emperor an order that some deputies should be sent to the court. The crowd, which had been waiting in anxious expectation, received the abbots with enthusiasm as they left the palace. Monks carrying lighted tapers, and chanting the 150th Psalm, escorted them to a church, where Dalmatius ascended the pulpit, read the Ephesian letter, and gave a report of the interview with the emperor, after which the whole multitude joined in shouting anathemas against Nestorius.^p

Some bishops of Cyril's party were now allowed to go to Constantinople, where their representations and solicitations, seconded

¹ Hardouin, i. 1537-40; Tillem. xiv. 417; Schröckh, xviii. 246.

^m Hard. i. 1581-4.

ⁿ Tillem. xiv. 405; Walch, v. 489.

^o Hard. i. 1588; Tillem. xiv. 406-7, 421. Some writers suppose that the

bearer was not a real beggar (Baron. 431. 108; Neander, iv. 164-5). Neander thinks that the device was adopted for the sake of effect, not from any actual necessity.

^p Hard. i. 1588-9; Tillem. xiv. 422-3.

by heavy bribes, were so effective that the most influential persons about the court were gained to the Alexandrian interest.^q

The council, in the mean time, held its second session on the 10th of July, when the envoys from Rome appeared, and were received with marks of honour. At the third session, the envoys expressed their approbation of what had been done, and signed the deposition of Nestorius.^r The hostile parties remained at Ephesus, threatening and excommunicating each other, "with equal pride," according to the expression of an ancient historian,^s and with a deplorable want of temper and decency on both sides. The emperor—supposing (it is said) that the depositions of Nestorius and of his enemies, Cyril and Memnon, were all determined by the whole council—confirmed the sentences;^t John, Count of the Sacred Largesses, who superseded Candidian as commissioner, put the three bishops under arrest;^u and in consequence of Cyril's removal, Juvenal, bishop of Jerusalem, became president of the council.^x The commissioner in vain attempted to mediate between the parties; he reported their mutual exasperation to his master, but laid the greater share of blame on the Cyrillians.^y The extreme heat of the summer, and the confinement within the walls of Ephesus, affected the health of many of the bishops, as well as of their attendants; a considerable number of deaths took place; while many, who had not made provision for so long an absence from their homes, were reduced to distress for the means of subsistence.^z

Dalmatius was again employed to represent the case of his friends to the emperor, and at length, at the request of both parties, a conference of eight bishops from each of the rival councils was held at Chalcedon, in the presence of Theodosius.^a The Court was now against Nestorius,—partly influenced by Cyril's money, partly by Pulcheria, whom the patriarch had offended, partly by dread of the monks and of the populace.^b Before the arrival of the bishops at Chalcedon, the emperor issued

^q Hard. i. 1580; Tillem. xiv. 425, 458; Bayle, art. *Nestorius*, n. C.; Walch, v. 534, 551. It is Cyril's use of bribery that draws from Tillemont the remark quoted, p. 440.

^r Hard. i. 1465-82.

^s "Pari fastu." Liberatus, c. 6 (Patrol. lxxviii. 981).

^t Hard. i. 1551-5; Tillem. xiv. 427; Walch, v. 506. Acacius of Berrhœa advised this. Hard. i. 1555.

^u Cyril. Epp. p. 92; Hard. i. 1555-7; Tillem. xiv. 455-7; Walch, v. 514-6.

^v If Cyril had presided in the quality of Cœlestine's representative, the presidency would have devolved on one of the other Roman legates. Dupin, iv. 320.

^y Cyril. Epp. pp. 90, seqq.; Tillem. xiv. 455-9; Walch, v. 517.

^a Hard. i. 1601; Tillem. xiv. 462-3.

^b Hard. i. 1562, 1609; Tillem. xiv. 438, 464-6, 470; Walch, v. 522; Schröckh, xviii. 254.

^c Walch, v. 548.

an order that Nestorius, agreeably to a request which he had formerly made, should retire to the monastery near Antioch of which he had been an inmate before his elevation. Nestorius, in acknowledging the receipt of this order, professed himself willing to suffer for the truth, but expressed a wish that an imperial mandate should be issued for a general condemnation of the Egyptian anathemas.^c

The deputies at Chalcedon had five audiences of the emperor. The party of Cyril refused to enter into any argument, and insisted on the condemnation of Nestorius, while their opponents were equally bent on that of Cyril's anathemas; and, as it became evident that no reconciliation could be expected, Theodosius resolved to put an end to the council. The letter in which he announced this determination appears to show that he was rather overpowered by the influence of Cyril than convinced of the justice of his cause; he declares that he cannot condemn the Orientals, since no one had argued against them, and they had not been convicted of any error before him. By the same letter it was ordered that Cyril and Memnon should retain their sees;^d and in the month of September Maximian, a monk of recluse and unambitious character, was ordained for Constantinople, in the room of Nestorius.^e

The Council of Ephesus is received as the Third General Council, and its doctrine respecting the Saviour's person is a part of the Catholic faith. But it would be vain to defend the proceedings of those by whom the true doctrine was there asserted;^f and there remains a question whether Nestorius was guilty of holding the errors for which it condemned him. Socrates, whose prejudices were all against Nestorius, acquits of him of any worse error than the use of improper language, into which the historian supposes him to have been led by a conceit of his own eloquence, and a disregard of the writings of earlier divines.^g The great body of the Orientals, who supported him at Ephesus, are unimpeached in their character for orthodoxy.^h Perhaps, therefore, Nestorius, in using the words which gave a colour to the charge of heresy, may, in truth, have meant only to guard against opposite errors which *might* have been inferred from the Alexandrian language, and which shortly after were actually put forth

^c Hard. i. 1631; Evagr. i. 7.

^d Hard. i. 1616; Tillem. xiv. 477, 483; Church, 409, 411.

Neand. iv. 172.

^e Hard. i. 1668; Soc. vii. 35.

^f See Newman, Proph. Office of the Church, 409, 411.

^g Soc. vii. 32.

^h Dupin. iv. 326; Tillem. xiv. 543-5.

by Eutyches; and the most startling of his expressions may rather have been exaggerations, into which he was driven by irritation, than serious denials of the truths which they seemed to contradict.¹ He steadily disavowed the more odious opinions which were imputed to him; he repeatedly professed his willingness to admit the term *Theotokos*, provided that it were guarded against obvious abuses.^k The controversy more than once appeared to be in such a position that it might have been ended by a word of explanation; but an unwillingness to concede, and personal animosities on both sides, prolonged it.^l

The breaking up of the council left the parties greatly exasperated against each other. The Orientals, on their way homewards, held a synod at Tarsus, and, after reaching Antioch, they held a second. At these meetings they renewed the deposition of Cyril, and extended the sentence to the bishops who had appeared against them at Chalcedon, and had consecrated Maximian for Constantinople; while they declared that they would never consent to the deposition of Nestorius; that they were resolved to adhere to the Nicene faith, and to resist the Egyptian anathemas.^m Theodoret, Andrew of Samosata, and others wrote against Cyril, and kept up a correspondence with the friends of Nestorius at Constantinople.ⁿ Many bishops were deprived, and the Church was in a miserable state of distraction.^o Theodosius was anxious for peace, and after a time, by advice of Maximian, proposed that the Bishops of Alexandria and Antioch should meet at Nicomedia, to confer on the means of restoring it. Count Aristolaus, to whom the letters were entrusted, was charged to labour for a reconciliation of the parties; and the emperor wrote to beg the prayers of Symeon the Stylite and the exertions of Acacius of Berrhœa, in furtherance of his pacific intentions.^p

John declined the conference on the ground of ill health, and also because he had been informed that there was a plot to waylay

¹ "In his calmer moments," says Gibbon, "Nestorius confessed that [the term *Theotokos*] might be tolerated or excused by the union of the two natures and the communication of their *idioms*; but he was exasperated by contradiction to . . . draw his inadequate similes from the conjugal or civil partnerships of life, and to describe the manhood of Christ as the robe, the instrument, the tabernacle of his Godhead." iv. 343-4.

^k Soc. vii. 34; Fleury, xxv. 29; Dupin, iv. 288; Mosh. i. 483-4; Schröckh,

xviii. 208; Walch, v. 778-802; Gieseler, I. ii. 140-1. See p. 439.

^l Walch, v. 849-851, 917, 926; Schröckh, xviii. 176.

^m Synodicon, ap. Baluz. Collect. Nova Concill., Paris, 1683, pp. 741, 769, 840, 843, 874, 906; Soc. vii. 34; Tillem. xiv. 495.

ⁿ Tillem. xiv. 491-3; 507-9.

^o Tillem. xiv. 497-500; Walch, v. 575.

^p Hard, i. 1683-8; Baron. 432. 47-50; Tillem. xiv. 514-6.

him.^q He consulted, however, with the bishops of his party, and it was agreed that, putting aside the personal question as to Nestorius, they would communicate with Cyril, on condition of his condemning his own anathemas and acknowledging the Nicene Creed as a sufficient rule of faith.^r Cyril was urged from many quarters to accept these terms. He replied that he had written nothing but what was conformable to the Catholic faith; that to condemn his own writings would be to deprive himself of the means of combating Nestorianism in future, but that he would give explanations of his former words, if the Orientals would accept the acts of the late Council, the deposition of Nestorius, and the ordination of Maximian; that he acknowledged the sufficiency of the Nicene Creed, but not in such a way as should exclude proper interpretations of it in points where it might be misrepresented by heretics;^s and, in a letter to Acacius, he stated his opinions in such a form that Theodoret declared him to be orthodox, and to have abandoned his former errors.^t John of Antioch was disposed to an accommodation, and sent Paul, bishop of Emesa, to Alexandria, with instructions to promote it. The mission was successful. Cyril subscribed a creed which was substantially the same with one drawn up by Theodoret at Ephesus; the envoy Dec. 432, preached thrice at Alexandria with great applause, Jan. 433. enlarging on the term *Theotokos*; and John agreed to sign the condemnation of Nestorius, and to approve the ordination of Maximian. On these terms Alexandria and Antioch were reconciled in April, 433.^u

In the course of these transactions Cyril expended enormous sums in bribes (or "benedictions,"^x as they were styled), for the purpose of maintaining his interest at court. A letter from his archdeacon Epiphanius to Maximian of Constantinople is extant, in which it is stated that the Alexandrians groaned under the heavy imposts to which they had been subjected in order to provide the means of this corruption, and that nevertheless a debt of fifteen hundred pounds of gold (upwards of 63,000*l.*) had been contracted in the name of the Church.^y

The accommodation was not satisfactory to the adherents of either side. Isidore of Pelusium, and other friends of Cyril,

^q Baluz. Coll. Nov. Concil. 754.

^r Ib. 756, 764, 766; Tillem. xiv. 517-8.

^s Cyrill. Epp. pp. 110, 155; Baluz. 759-762; Tillem. xiv. 519-521, 535.

^t Cyrill. t. v. 93; t. vi. 145, seqq.; Theodoret. Ep. 112, p. 983.

^u Cyrill. Epp. pp. 100-120, 156; Hard. i. 1688-1708; Tillem. xiv. 523-5, 527-9, 530-4, 536-8, 542-7; Walch, v. 595, 600-4, 621; Gieseler, I. ii. 150-1.

^x *εὐλογία*. Comp. 2 Kings v. 15; 2 Cor. ix. 5.

^y Baluz. 907-9; Gibbon, iv. 349.

expressed surprise that he had agreed to admit two natures in the Saviour.^z He replied that, while in one sense he acknowledged two natures, in another sense he allowed only one; that the two natures are separate in conception, although united in the one person of Christ, and that their predicates are properly distinct—a statement which Nestorius himself would probably not have declined, and might in fairness have been invited to accept.^a On the other hand, Theodoret remonstrated with John against making peace on such terms as would not secure the restoration of the deposed bishops and include all who had been in the same interest. That Cyril, after having proved himself orthodox by his late explanations, should require consent to the condemnation of Nestorius, was, he said, much the same as if a convert from Arianism were to insist on anathematising those who had always been sound as to the doctrine of the Son's consubstantiality with the Father; he was still for a condemnation of Cyril's anathemas, and declared that he would rather suffer both his hands to be cut off than subscribe the condemnation of Nestorius.^b Others, among whom was Theodoret's metropolitan, Alexander, bishop of Hierapolis, an aged and venerable man, still refused to admit the orthodoxy of Cyril.^c Under the pretence that Alexander had forfeited or abdicated his rights as metropolitan, John took it upon himself to ordain some bishops for the Euphratesian province; and the proceeding called forth a loud remonstrance, both as being an invasion of jurisdiction, and on account of the personal character of the new bishops. Nine provinces of the Antiochene patriarchate renounced communion with John, who at length called in the aid of the secular power to eject such bishops as refused to accede to his agreement with Cyril.^d

Theodoret was prepared to withdraw into a monastery; but the urgent entreaties of his flock prevailed on him to seek an interview with John, and he agreed to retain his see on condition of being excused from condemning Nestorius or his opinions.^e Alexander, however, continued to resist all importunities; he declared that if all the dead were to rise and testify in favour of the

^z Isid. Pelus. Ep. i. 324; Hard. i. 1635-7; Liberatus, 8 (Patrol. lxxviii. 984); Giesel. I. ii. 150.

^a Cyrill. Epp. pp. 118, 133-5, 135, seqq.; Tillem. xiv. 566-571; Walch, v. 623-4; Neander, iv. 175-6; Gieseler, I. ii. 151; Dorner, ii. 85. Tillemont remarks, that, but for the opposition of the Orientals, which drew forth such explanations from Cyril, the Euty-

chians might at a later time have been much stronger in their arguments from authority.

^b Baluz. 766-7, 795, 823; Gieseler, I. ii. 151.

^c Baluz. 800, &c.

^d Tillem. xiv. 523, 554-6, 573-9; Neand. iv. 178-181.

^e Tillem. xiv. 580-5; xv. 250; Neand. iv. 183. See Baluze.

Egyptian doctrines, he must yet follow the light of his own conscience, and reject them.^f It was in vain that Theodoret endeavoured either to mitigate the sternness of his resolution or to prevail with John that the law might not be enforced against a man so greatly revered; the aged bishop was ejected from Hierapolis, and was banished to the mines of Famothim, April, 435. in Egypt, while his clergy and people displayed their grief at his removal by closing for a time all the churches of the diocese.^g Other recusant bishops were driven from their sees by military force, and by such means a general conformity was established throughout the East in the year 435.^h

The original author of these commotions was, notwithstanding the remonstrances of Cœlestine with the emperor,ⁱ allowed to remain nearly four years in his retirement at Antioch, where he was treated with great respect,^k and enjoyed the correspondence of his friends. On the death of Maximian, in 434, the partisans of Nestorius demanded that he should be reinstated in the bishoprick of Constantinople; and so serious was the danger of an outbreak that the emperor hastened to fill up the vacancy by nominating Proclus, who was installed while the late bishop was yet unburied.^l The demonstration at Constantinople may probably have served to bespeak attention to a representation which John of Antioch made in the following year, that Nestorius persisted in his blasphemies and was perverting many from the faith; whereupon an edict was issued, commanding that all the heresiarch's books should be burnt, that his followers should be called *Simonians*, "even as the Arians were styled *Porphyrians* by a law of Constantine of blessed memory," and that their meetings should be suppressed.^m His property was seized, and he was sentenced to be banished to Petra for life;ⁿ but (apparently before this sentence had been executed) the place of his exile was changed to the Great Oasis.^o There he employed himself in composing a history of his troubles;

^f Baluz. 866.

^g Pagi, vii. 466-7, 476-7; Tillem. xiv. 582-5, 592-8, 601-3; Dupin, iv. 313-5.

^h Tillem. xiv. 604; Fleury, xxvi. 33; Walch, v. 634-8.

ⁱ Hard. i. 1673, 1675.

^k Pagi in Baron. vii. 402; Tillem. xiv. 494, 607; Walch, v. 559; Schröckh, xviii. 280-1.

^l See Socr. vii. 35-6, 40; Tillem. xiv. 571-3; xv. 706-7. Tillemont remarks that such a nomination was awkward as a precedent, but that, as the love of the people for Proclus was well known, it

was an anticipation of their choice, not an usurpation of their rights. Proclus had been set aside after the deposition of Nestorius, on account of the canonical objection to translations. But on an investigation of the case, it was declared that, as he had never obtained possession of the see to which he was consecrated (see p. 435), the objection did not apply to him. Soc. l. c.

^m Cod. Theod. XVI. v. 66. See p. 206.

ⁿ Hard. i. 1669.

^o Ib. 1715-8; Tillem. xiv. 608-9.

but after a time he was carried off by the Blemmyes, a wild tribe of marauders who devastated the Oasis. The old man was dismissed by his captors as useless, and surrendered himself to an imperial officer in Egypt, who inhumanly caused him to be hurried from place to place until he sank under the treatment. A writer quoted by Evagrius relates that his tongue was eaten up by worms, and that so he “departed to everlasting torment.” Other authors, of kindred spirit, however, are not content with less than a living putrefaction of the heresiarch’s whole body.^p

Fresh discords broke out in the East on the subject of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Diodore of Tarsus. The memory of these teachers had some years before been attacked by Rabula, bishop of Edessa, who, after having acted with the Orientals at Ephesus, made himself conspicuous by the vehemence with which he espoused the opposite side.^q Now that Nestorianism was formally suppressed, Cyril resolved to make an attempt against the authority of Diodore and Theodore, whose writings were diligently read by the Nestorians since those of their nominal leader had been forbidden. The attempt was eagerly urged on by a strong monastic party; and Rabula and other bishops took part in it.^r Proclus, of Constantinople, extracted some propositions from the works of Theodore, and, without naming the source, proposed that they should be generally condemned;^s but some over-zealous agents betrayed the authorship, and the name of Theodore, which was generally revered throughout the East, excited a commotion.^t A synod of bishops, held at Antioch, while they approved of Proclus’ doctrine, appealed to Theodosius against a condemnation of one who had done important services to the Church; they said that the language quoted from Theodore had been used by him in controversy with Arians and Eunomians, and ought to be interpreted with a fair consideration of its object;^u and the emperor, in consequence of this appeal, recommended that nothing should be done against the memory of men who had deserved well of the Church and had died in its communion. Proclus withdrew from the affair, declaring

^p Evagr. i. 7; Theod. Lector, ii. 38; Theophanes, p. 142; Baron. 436. 9; Gibbon, iv. 350-1; Neand. iv. 188-190. The death of Nestorius is generally placed about A.D. 440, and the story that he lived till the Synod of Chalcedon (A.D. 451), and was summoned to it, is rejected. It was circulated by the Eutychians for the purpose of discredit-

ing that Council. See Walch, vi. 461; Gibbon, iv. 351; Gieseler, I. ii. 347.

^q Hard. i. 1634; Tillem. xiv. 504-5.

^r Cyrill. Epp. pp. 197-8; Tillem. xiv. 624-8; xv. 256; Walch, v. 639-640.

^s Procl. Ep. ad Armenos, ap. Hard. i. 1723, seqq.

^t Cyrill. Epp. p. 197.

^u Ib. 192-3, 200.

that he had not intended any censure against the person of Theodore; and Cyril himself at length found it expedient to desist from the prosecution of his attempt, and to profess himself satisfied with the condemnation of Theodore's errors which was implied in the sentence against Nestorius.^x He afterwards wrote against Theodore, and was answered by Theodoret.

Although suppressed within the empire, Nestorianism found a refuge beyond its bounds. At Edessa there was a flourishing school of clergy for the Persian Church. Its head, Ibas, was favourable to Nestorius, and translated some works of Diodore and Theodore into Syriac. Rabula, in 435, broke up the institution; but Ibas, who succeeded him as bishop, re-established it,^y and it continued to flourish until the reign of Zeno, by whom it was finally suppressed in 485.^z From this seminary Nestorianism was propagated in Persia and India; and the doctrine continued to exercise a powerful influence on the Christianity of the East.

^x Cyrill. Epp. p. 200; Tillem. xiv. 506, 564; Gieseler, I. ii. 153.
628-642; Dupin, iv. 318; Neander, iv. 373; Theod. Lect. ii. 49; Tillem. xvi.
192-5. 373; Schröckh, xviii. 307-311; Dorner,

^y Theod. Lector, ii. 5; Tillem. xiv. ii. 87.

CHAPTER X.

EUTYCHIANISM.—THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON.—ADVANCE OF THE ROMAN SEE.

I. WHEN Dalmatius went to the palace of Constantinople for the purpose of representing the case of Cyril and the Ephesian Council, one of the most remarkable persons among the multitude which accompanied him was Eutyches, abbot of a large monastery near the city. Like Dalmatius, he had at that time remained nearly fifty years within the walls of his retreat, and had resolved never to leave them, but considered the peril of the faith a sufficient ground for breaking through his determination.^a Eutyches was generally revered for sanctity, and was highly regarded by Cyril on account of his zeal against Nestorianism; but he appears to have been a person of narrow understanding and obstinate temper.^b He was himself soon to give name to a heresy which produced a longer controversy, more complicated dissensions, and a more disastrous schism than the errors which he so warmly opposed.^c

Notwithstanding the formal reconciliation which had been established, a difference of opinion, and mutual suspicions, continued to exist between the Egyptian and the Syrian schools. The Syrians considered the Egyptians to be tainted with Apollinarianism, and were in their turn regarded by them as Nestorians. The monks in general were violent against Nestorianism, which they were fond of imputing to their ecclesiastical superiors, and to all others who neglected to court their favour. Imperfectly understanding the system to which they professed to adhere, they exaggerated the Alexandrian forms of expression, and, under pretence of reverence for divine mysteries, made use of words which seemed to annihilate the Saviour's humanity. They spoke of it as "absorbed in his Godhead, like a drop of honey in the ocean;"^d some of them were grossly Apollinarian in their lan-

^a Labb. iv. 191, 201, 206. See Walch, vi. 32.

^b Labb. iv. 36, b.; Tillem. xv. 486-7; Comp. Schröckh, xviii. 438.

^c Schröckh, xviii. 435-6. The Eutychian controversy, and those which arose

out of it, fill three volumes (vi.-viii.), averaging about 1000 pages each, in Walch's laborious and inconceivably tedious 'Historie der Ketzereien.'

^d Theodoret. Eran. ii. t. iv. p. 77.

guage.^e Theodoret, perceiving that this tendency, even if it did not introduce positive heresy, must throw back Theology into the undefined state from which the writers and the councils of more than two centuries had been labouring to deliver it, wrote, in 447, a dialogue in three books, entitled "*Eranistes*" (*The Man of Scraps*)—so called because he considered the opinions which he combated to be no new invention, but, like a beggar's coat, a patchwork of fragments collected from various quarters.^f The doctrines which he maintained in this work as to the unchangeableness, distinctness, and impassibility of the Redeemer's Godhead were made by his enemies the foundation for charging him with holding *two* Sons; and Theodoret, with Ibas of Edessa, and Irenæus of Tyre, was marked out by the monastic party for special vengeance.^g

Dioscorus, who, in 444, succeeded Cyril as bishop of Alexandria, is said to have borne a high character before his elevation,^h but afterwards showed himself violent, tyrannical, rapacious, and scandalously immoral. He had with him the favour of the court, and especially that of Chrysaphius, the eunuch who held sway over the feeble Theodosius; and he kept up an extensive correspondence with the monks in Syria and elsewhere who were ill affected towards their bishops.ⁱ Dioscorus took offence at Theodoret for having signed a synodical letter of Proclus,—
A.D. 447.
 an act which, according to the Alexandrian bishop, implied an acknowledgment of the precedence of Constantinople, or even of its jurisdiction over the Syrian patriarchate; he charged him with Nestorian heresy, and, although Theodoret disavowed and condemned the errors imputed to him, he uttered an anathema against him.^j The secular power was set in motion against the bishop of Cyrus; an imperial edict was issued in 447 or 448, by which he was accused of exciting disturbances by holding frequent meetings, and was ordered to confine himself to his diocese.^k Ibas was about the same time harassed with accusations
A.D. 448-9.
 by the monastic party, but succeeded in making his peace.^l The Orientals attempted to vindicate their orthodoxy

^e Dupin, iv. 328; Walch, vi. 100; Neander, iv. 199; Gieseler, I. ii. 155. See note in Fleury, iii. 345; Dorner, ii. 62.

^f Theod. t. iv. p. 2. See Dorner, ii. 101-3.

^g Tillem. xv. 269, 270-2, 481-3; Schröckh, xviii. 418-9; Neander, iv. 201. As to Irenæus, see Tillem. xv. 265-7; as to Ibas, Walch, vi. 54.

^h See Theodoret, Ep. 60 (t. iii.).

ⁱ Fleury, xxvii. 3; Tillem. xv. 434-7, 481-3; Neand. iv. 198-9.

^j Theod. Epp. 82-6; t. v. pp. 101, seqq.

^k Epp. 79-82; Tillem. xv. 273-5, 278-280.

^l Tillem. xv. 465-479; Walch, vi. 54-78; Schröckh, xv. 438-9.

by sending a deputation to court, of which the result is not recorded.^m

A rumour arose that Eutyches, in the eagerness of his opposition to Nestorianism, had vented unsound opinions on the doctrine of the Incarnation. Domnus, bishop of Antioch, made a representation on the subject to Flavian of Constantinople, charging Eutyches with Apollinarianism and with confounding the Saviour's natures; but as the Syrian accusers lay under a suspicion of Nestorianism, the charge met with little or no attention.ⁿ In 448, however, at a meeting of the local synod of Constantinople,^o which was attended by about thirty bishops, Eusebius of Dorylæum (the same who had been the first to oppose Nestorius)^p denounced Eutyches as a heretic, stating that he had in vain endeavoured by private conference to convince him of his errors, and desiring that an inquiry should be made into the abbot's opinions.^q

Flavian, the successor of Proclus, knowing the powerful interests by which Eutyches was likely to be supported,^r and dreading a general disturbance of the Church, endeavoured to dissuade Eusebius from proceeding, but was obliged reluctantly to grant the investigation.^s At the first summons Eutyches refused to appear before the council, alleging his resolution not to quit his monastery; but he was told that this was no reasonable excuse, and was reminded of the part which he had taken in the Nestorian controversy.^t After repeated citations he made his appearance attended by a large body of monks and soldiers, whose protection he professed to think necessary for his safety, and accompanied by the patrician Florentius, who, by a remarkable innovation, was commissioned to assist at the trial on the ground that it was a question of faith,^u whereas in all previous controversies the imperial commissioners had been restricted to the

^m Theod. Epp. 95, 101-3; Tillem. xv. 289, 486.

ⁿ Facund. pro Tribus Capp. viii. 5; xii. 5 (Patrol. lxxvii.); Walch, vi. 102, 105. Some place this as early as 441.

^o *σύνδος ἐνδημοῦσα*—a council composed of such bishops as happened to be in the capital. See below, p. 475.

^p See p. 439.

^q Hard. ii. 110-2; Tillem. xv. 494-7.

^r There is a story that, on the appointment of Flavian to his see (A.D. 446), Chrysaphius sent to demand *eulogiae* (benedictions) from him—this being the name given to the presents which were

made in consideration of influence employed in such matters; and that Flavian offended the eunuch either by sending him the church-plate in order to shame him, or by sending some consecrated loaves, of the kind called *eulogiae*, and, on being told that gold was required, by answering that he had none but the sacred vessels, since the funds of the church belonged to God and his poor. Evagr. ii. 2; Tillem. xv. 446.

^s Hard. ii. 112-3.

^t Ib. 144, 149.

^u Ib. 160.

regulation of external matters.^x On being questioned, Eutyches professed that he held the Nicene faith, and cited a prohibition which the Council of Ephesus had uttered against the imposition of any other formulary.^y He said that there were two natures in Christ before his incarnation;^z he admitted, although with hesitation, the phrase that Christ is "consubstantial with us according to his flesh," as well as with the Father according to his Godhead.^a But his answers were equivocal and unsatisfactory. He stated that he held only "one incarnate nature of God the Word"—a phrase for which he referred to the authority of Athanasius and of Cyril.^b He professed an unwillingness to define, a reverence for Scripture, and a wish not to go beyond it; and he refused to anathematize the errors of which he was suspected, although he professed himself willing to accept in part the language opposed to them.^c The synod found his statements insufficient, and pronounced him guilty of renewing the errors of Valentinus and Apollinaris; he was sentenced to deprivation of his abbacy and to deposition from the priesthood; and he and all who should adhere to him were declared excommunicate.^d It would seem that there was some confusion in the proceedings of this council. Eutyches afterwards complained of it as unfair, and asserted that he had appealed from it to the judgment of Rome, Alexandria, and Jerusalem;^e but his appeal was not made in the form or at the time which were necessary to its technical validity.^f

Eutyches busied himself in writing to bishops and others in all directions. By way of accounting for his refusal to acknowledge the two natures, he alleged that he was apprehensive of contravening the Council of Ephesus by exceeding the definitions of the Nicene creed. He loudly complained of injustice, and urged that a general council should be summoned.^g His monks adhered to

^x Tillem. xv. 506-8; Schröckh, xviii. 443-4; Neand. iv. 206.

^y Conc. Ephes. ap. Hard. i. 1525.

^z This might have been interpreted as meaning a pre-existence of the Saviour's humanity,—thus making two *persons* in Christ, which is the error imputed to Nestorius; but the real meaning of Eutyches evidently was, that he acknowledged an abstract human nature as well as the impersonate Divinity—that the two were distinct in *conception*. Tillem. xv. 489-490; Neander, iv. 207.

^a Hard. ii. 164-5.

^b Ib. 168. See above, p. 436. Pétau says that there may be three senses of this expression, and that Eutyches had

not the penetration to discriminate between the sound and the unsound senses. De Incarn. I. xiv. 6-8; IV. vi.-viii.

^c Tillem. xv. 500, 509-512; Neand. iv. 207-8; Gieseler, I. ii. 155-7.

^d Hard. ii. 168.

^e Inter Epp. Leon. 21.

^f Ib.; Evagr. i. 9; Schröckh, xviii. 445-6. It will be observed that Antioch was excluded from this appeal. Rome was probably included from a belief that, as on former occasions, it would side with the monastic party. Neand. iv. 210.

^g Eutych. ap. Leon. Ep. xxi. 1; Pet. Chrysolog. ad Eutych. (Patrol. lii. 24); Tillem. xv. 522-3.

him in defiance of the sentence, and were put under a sort of interdict by Flavian for their contumacy;^h while Dioscorus, contrary to all canonical order, admitted Eutyches to communion, and acknowledged him both as a priest and as an abbot.ⁱ But the condemnation which had been pronounced was received with general approbation. Leo, of Rome, a man of great ability and energy, who was bent on asserting all the real or imaginable rights of his see, on receiving representations of the case from Theodosius and Eutyches, wrote to Flavian, professing surprise that *he* had not before reported it; but, on receiving the patriarch's explanation, and the acts of the late synod, he expressed his satisfaction with the decision.^k Theodosius in vain attempted to bring about a reconciliation between Flavian and Eutyches. The patriarch, in answer to a question as to his own faith, admitted the expression, "one nature of the Incarnate Word,"^l on the ground that the person of Christ is one, and he anathematized Nestorius; but he would not allow the sufficiency of the Nicene creed to shelter Eutyches in the opinions which had been condemned.^m The opponents of Eutyches deprecated the assembling of a general council, as being unnecessary in so clear a case, and as likely to throw the whole Church into confusion. The dominant eunuch Chrysaphius, however, favoured the proposal, and citations were issued, by which the chief
A.D. 449. bishop of each eastern diocese was required to take with him ten metropolitans and ten other bishops.ⁿ The council was packed with gross unfairness. An imperial letter, after mentioning in a tone of disapproval the proceedings of Flavian against Eutyches, declared that the assembly had been summoned in order to root out the remains of Nestorianism—as if the later heresy were not in question.^o The bishops who had taken part in the judgment on Eutyches, and the Orientals who had been suspected of Nestorianism, were not to be allowed any voice; while Barsumas, a Syrian abbot, was to have a seat and the privileges of a bishop, as representing the malcontent monastic party.^p Theo-

^h Labb. iv. 278.

ⁱ Ib. 463. Tillemont strangely says that the enmity between Alexandria and Constantinople was so old that it could not have entered into the motives of Dioscorus. xv. 524-5.

^k Epp. 23, 26-7 (Patrol. liv.).

^l Hard. ii. 8. This was admitted in order to save the honour of Athanasius and Cyril. Schröckh, xviii. 452.

^m Labb. iv. 16.

ⁿ Hard. ii. 72. Tillemont says that Egypt had but eight metropolitans (xv. 528). Mr. Neale, that it had none (Holy Eastern Church, Alexandria, i. 290. But compare his Introduction, i. 112-3). See above, p. 447, note ^e.

^o Hard. ii. 77-9.

^p Ib. 76; Baron. 449. 29-30; Walch, vi. 202-3, 253-4.

doret was expressly forbidden to attend the council, unless his presence should be unanimously desired by its members.^q Two lay officers, the Counts Elpidius and Eulogius, were commissioned to keep order, and to imprison any persons who might be refractory.^r

The council met in the same church at Ephesus in which the Third General Council had sat eighteen years before. ^{Aug. 8,}
A hundred and twenty-six bishops were present at the ^{449.} opening. Dioscorus had with him a large train of monks and parabolani, and Barsumas appeared at the head of a thousand rabid monks, prepared to coerce the assembly by their violence.^s Leo, after having in vain endeavoured that it might be held in Italy, had excused himself from appearing, on the ground that the Roman bishops were not accustomed to attend councils beyond the seas, and also on account of the political troubles of his country.^t He deputed three legates as his representatives, and sent by them a document which, under the name of his *Tome* or *Letter to Flavian*,^u become very famous in the controversy. In this the entireness and yet the distinctness of the two natures united in the Saviour were defined with an ability, a command of Scripture proof, and a copiousness of illustration for which it has been thought necessary to account by fables as to the circumstances in which Leo composed the letter, and by referring the final revision of it to the Apostle St. Peter.^x

As the bishop of Rome was not present, and the bishop of Constantinople was a party in the cause, Dioscorus was entitled to preside in right of his see; but the presidency was expressly confirmed to him by an imperial rescript.^y The proceedings were violent and disorderly from the beginning. Dioscorus turned out all reporters but those of his own party,^z and, although Leo's

^q Hard. ii. 72. See a letter of Theodoret's when the council was in prospect. Ep. 112.

^r Hard. ii. 76-7.

^s Tillem. xv. 552-3; Neand. iv. 213.

^t Ep. xxxi. 4; Pagi, viii. 10; Tillem. xv. 538-9, 549, 902.

^u Ep. 28.

^x Moschus, Prat. Spirit. 147 (Patrol. lxxiv.); Baron. 449, 40, 46-58. "He leid the lettir upon Seint Petir auter, praying to Seynt Petir that if onything were wrong writen, Seint Petir schuld amend it, and aftir iii days, he found it rased, and amended aftir the plesauns of God." (Capgrave, Chron. of England,

86, London, 1858.) Gennadius says that Prosper of Aquitaine dictated letters against Eutyches for Leo (De Scriptt. Eccl. 84); and some have understood him to mean the letter to Flavian. But it is generally believed to be Leo's own work. See Patrol. lvi. 1108; liv. 753; Marcellinus, A.D. 463 (ib. li.). For a criticism on the letter, see Dorner, ii. 109-113.

^y Hard. ii. 80. Liberatus says that the Roman legates claimed the presidency, but that the claim was not allowed. c. 2 (Patrol. lxxviii. 1004).

^z Labb. iv. 128.

letter was received by the council, he contrived to prevent the reading of it.^a Eutyches presented a petition, giving his account of the previous transactions, and praying, not for his own restoration—for that he supposed to be secured by the Alexandrian recognition of him—but for the punishment of his enemies.^b Flavian requested that the accuser, Eusebius of Dorylæum, should be heard, but was rebuked by the commissioner Elpidius for interfering, and was told that the opponents of Eutyches had already had their opportunity of speaking at Constantinople.^c The acts of the Constantinopolitan synod were read,^d and whenever any of its members was reported to have spoken of *two natures*, there were loud outcries from the monks and the multitude—"Nestorian! Tear him asunder! Burn him alive! As he divides, so let him be divided!"^e It was agreed that Eutyches should be recognised as orthodox, together with his monks, who in insolent language demanded that Flavian should be punished as he had punished them.^f The prohibition which the Council of Ephesus had passed against adding to the Nicene faith was often appealed to, but with an evident perversion of its meaning, since it had not really been intended to exclude any explanation of articles in which the creed might be misrepresented. An anathema against Nestorius was proposed. Dioscorus desired that all who could not make their shouts heard should stretch out their hands in token of assent; and the anathema was pronounced amid cries of "Drive out, burn, tear, cut asunder, massacre—all who hold two natures!"^g Some of the bishops who had sat in the Council of Constantinople quailed before the storm, and retracted the words which they had formerly used.^h

Dioscorus then demanded whether those who contravened the canons of the Council of Ephesus and the Nicene Creed did not deserve punishment. The bishops assented, and he produced a sentence against Flavian and Eusebius. Flavian protested against being judged by him, and gave into the hands of the Roman legates an appeal to Rome and the West.ⁱ A number of bishops gathered round Dioscorus, and on their knees implored him not

^a Leo, Ep. xlv. 2; Hard. ii. 88.

^b Hard. ii. 104-5.

^c Ib. 106.

^d Eutyches had accused Flavian of falsifying these acts. An investigation had consequently been held by a commission of bishops and civil officers, but nothing had been proved against the correctness of the report. Hard. ii. 172,

seqq.; Evagr. i. 9; Tillem. xv. 533-8; Schröckh, xviii. 455-6.

^e Hard. ii. 161, &c.

^f Ib. 236-8.

^g Labb. iv. 114, 160.

^h Ib. 114.

ⁱ Ib. 306; Leo, Ep. xlv. 3. Against the idea that he appealed to the pope alone, see Tillem. xv. 568; Dupin, iv. 342; Walch, vi. 257-260.

to proceed; but, disregarding their entreaties, he exclaimed "Call in the Counts!" and the proconsul of Asia entered, attended by soldiers and monks, with swords, clubs, and chains. The bishops in terror attempted to hide themselves in corners of the church or under benches; but they were dragged out, and with threats, abusive language, and blows were compelled to sign the condemnation of Flavian,—or rather a blank paper, on which the sentence was afterwards to be copied.^k It is said that Dioscorus and Barsumas struck Flavian in the face, kicked him, and stamped on him;^m and, although the report of these savage acts may be an exaggeration, it seems to be certain that, in consequence of the treatment which he received in the council, the patriarch of Constantinople died within a few days, on his way to a place of banishment.ⁿ Eusebius of Dorylæum was deposed and imprisoned, but found means of escaping to Rome.^o Theodoret and Ibas, although confined to their own dioceses, were cited, and in their absence condemned as heretics.^p Domnus, of Antioch, who had weakly consented to the earlier acts of the council, was at last deposed on the charge of approving a Nestorian sermon, which was said (probably without truth) to have been preached in his presence by Theodoret. He retired into a monastery, and made no attempt to recover his see.^q One of the Roman legates had died on his way to the council.^r Of the survivors, it seems probable that the elder, Julius, bishop of Puteoli, was overpowered, and consented to the proceedings of Dioscorus;^a but the younger, Hilary, then a deacon, and afterwards Leo's successor, met them with a spirited and resolute opposition, which so provoked the Eutychian party that he was obliged to abscond from Ephesus, and to travel by unfrequented ways to Rome.^b

Theodosius, by edicts which bore the name of the western emperor as well as his own, confirmed the decisions of the council, taxing the deposed bishops with Nestorianism, and ordering that

^k Hard. ii. 216; Liberatus, 12; Tillem. xv. 559, 570-2. There are 149 signatures—10 of them made by proxy.

^m Evagrius, ii. 2, says that Eusebius of Dorylæum accused Dioscorus of acting thus. Schröckh would seem to have overlooked the passage when he named Theophanes, a writer of the ninth century, as the oldest authority for the story. xviii. 465.

ⁿ Liberat. 12; Nat. Alex. ix. 167; Tillem. xv. 570-3, 905-6; Walch, vi. 265.

^o Tillem. xv. 574.

^p Theod. Ep. 116.

^q Evagr. i. 10. The council of Chalcedon assigned him an allowance out of the revenues of Antioch. Hard. ii. 544. Liberatus says that he was condemned for having censured Cyril's anathemas as obscure. c. 12 (Patrol. lxxviii. 1005).

^r See Dupin, iv. 339; Walch, vi. 251-2.

^a Leo, however, speaks as if they had both protested. Epp. xlv. 2; xlv. 2, &c. So Liberatus, c. 12.

^b Leo, Epp. xlv. 2; xlv. 2; Hilar. ib. xlv. See Tillem. xv. 568, 577.

their writings should be burnt, and that no one should give shelter to them or to their followers.^c In the face of these edicts, Leo with a Roman synod declared the proceedings at Ephesus invalid. The assembly, he said, was not a council, but a meeting of robbers (*Latrocinium*)^d—a name which was generally adopted and has continued to be used in designating it; and he applied, although in vain, to Theodosius for a fresh council, to be held in Italy.^e Early in the following year, a visit which Valentinian, with his wife and mother, paid to Rome—probably for the festival

A.D. 450.

of St. Peter's Chair (Feb. 22)—afforded the pope another opportunity of urging his cause. As the imperial party entered the church of the Apostle, Leo appeared at the head of a large company of bishops, and, prostrating himself on the floor, represented with tears the miserable distractions of the Oriental Church, where Egypt, Thrace, and Palestine were arrayed against Syria, Pontus, and Asia;^f he implored Valentinian and the princesses to intercede with the eastern emperor that the sentences against Flavian and others might be annulled, and that a new general council might be assembled in Italy. They assented, and fulfilled their promise by writing to Theodosius and Pulcheria; but Theodosius was persuaded to reply that he had not innovated on the faith; that the proceedings of the late synod had been fair; that it had produced excellent effects; and that the East was now united in the true doctrine.^g

The sudden death of Theodosius, which took place a few months later, was followed by important changes in ecclesiastical matters. Pulcheria had always been opposed to the Eutychian party, and had kept up a correspondence with Leo.^h The minister, Chrysaphius, was put to death. Marcian united with his empress in the wish to favour orthodoxy, and expressed his willingness to summon a general council.ⁱ Leo desired that the assembly might be held in Italy, and that it might not discuss matters of faith—since these had been already sufficiently settled—but might limit itself to a consideration of the questions as to the bishops who had been condemned.^k In this the pope evidently aimed at the advancement of the Roman authority by obtaining a recognition of his letter to Flavian as the standard of orthodoxy on the Incarnation.^l But Marcian also had an object in appointing a

^c Labb. iv. 863.

^d Ep. xcvi. 2.

^e Epp. 43, 45, 54.

^f Tillem. xv. 589-592.

^g The letters to Theodosius and Pulcheria are in the collection of Leo's

Epistles, 55-9; the answers, 62-4.

^h Tillem. xv. 597-600.

ⁱ Ap. Leon. Epp. 73, 76.

^k Epp. 82-3, 94; Evagr. ii. 2.

^l Walch, vi. 323-4; Schröckh, xviii. 469-470; Neander, iv. 222.

place of meeting within his own dominions; and to this determination he steadily adhered.

Anatolius, an Alexandrian, had been consecrated by Dioscorus for Constantinople, and requested the communion of Rome. As the see had become vacant by the death of Flavian, there was no irregularity in the appointment of his successor; Leo, therefore, expressed a willingness to recognise the new patriarch, if he would give a satisfactory statement of his faith, and would anathematize all who taught amiss on the subject of the Incarnation. The application of Anatolius was recommended by a letter from Marcian; and on signing the epistle to Flavian, he was admitted by Leo to communion.^m

The enemies of Theodoret had succeeded by means of bribery in procuring an imperial edict which ordered that his books should be burnt, and that no one should read them or give him shelter.ⁿ He remained in retirement in a monastery at Apamea, from which he wrote to Leo, asking whether he ought to submit to the judgment of the Ephesian council, and begging for a recognition of his orthodoxy, in proof of which he appealed to his numerous writings and to his labours for the faith.^o His case was examined by a council at Rome, and Leo granted him communion.^p In the beginning of 451, Marcian allowed the banished bishops to return from their exile; but he reserved the question of their restoration to their sees for the consideration of the general council, which was appointed to meet at Nicæa on the 1st of September.^q

Although Leo had been unable to contrive that the council should assemble in Italy, or to limit the subject of its discussions, he resolved to turn it to the best advantage. He had already sent a bishop and a presbyter into the East, on account of the negotiations with Anatolius and other bishops who desired his communion;^r and to these envoys he now added another of each order. His instructions to the legates were in a very lofty style: they were to assume the presidency of the council; nothing was to be transacted except in their presence; they were not to admit Dioscorus to appear as a judge, but as an accused person. The legates endeavoured to act up to these orders; but, although much was allowed

^m Epp. Leon. 69-71, 80, 83; Tillem. xv. 587-9, 607-8, 617.

ⁿ Theod. t. iv. p. 703; Epp. 119, 140.

^o Ep. 113, or in Leo, Ep. 52. That Theodoret did not mean to appeal to the pope alone, but to all western bishops, see Tillemont, xv. 294; Barrow,

236-8. His letter, amidst all the celebration of the Roman *primacy* which his circumstances rendered natural, gives no hint of a *supremacy*.

^p Pagi, viii. 61; Tillem. xv. 305, 636.

^q Hard. ii. 45; Evagr. ii. 2.

^r Epp. 83-6.

to them, they were not permitted to exercise that uncontrolled supremacy which their master contemplated.^s

The opening of the council was delayed for some weeks, and the place of meeting was altered to Chalcedon, in order that it might be held under the eye of the emperor, who had promised to be present if it were in his power, but was prevented by public business from leaving Constantinople.^t The number of bishops is traditionally stated at six hundred and thirty; the council itself reckons five hundred and twenty.^u All were from the East, with the exception of Leo's envoys, and of two African bishops, who, however, do not appear to have been commissioned as representatives of their brethren.^x The Roman legates and Anatolius of Constantinople sat as presidents of the clergy; but the real direction of the council was in the hands of the emperor's commissioners—nineteen civil officers, who had held the highest dignities in the state.^y

The first session was held on the 8th of October, in the church of the martyr St. Euphemia, which was built on a gentle eminence without the walls of Chalcedon. Evagrius describes with enthusiasm the beauties of the situation and prospect, and adds curious statements as to miracles customarily performed at the church, by the blood and other relics of the patroness.^z As soon as the members of the council had taken their places, the Roman legates rose and, speaking in Latin, demanded that Dioscorus should not be allowed to sit as a judge; otherwise, they said, their instructions would oblige them to withdraw. The commissioners told them that, if they were to be judges, they must not make themselves parties; but after some discussion, Dioscorus was desired to take a seat in the midst of the assembly, as a person under accusation.^a Eusebius of Dorylæum then brought forward a petition charging Dioscorus with wrongs towards himself, the late bishop of Constantinople, and the Catholic faith—a document which had been presented to the emperor, and by him had been referred to the council.^b By desire of both Eusebius and Dioscorus, the acts of the Latrocinium (which included those of the Constantinopolitan synod against Eutyches) were produced, and the reading of them was begun. On the occurrence of Theodoret's name in the acts, the commissioners ordered that he should be called in. This was the signal

^s Epp. 88-93; Tillem. xv. 631-4.

^t Hard. ii. 49-52; Baron. 451. 30-3.

^u See Dupin, iv. 346; Walch, vi. 401-2.

^x Tillem. xv. 640; Walch, vi. 403.

^y Barrow, 192; Tillem. xv. 642-6; Planck, i. 685; Neand. iv. 224.

^z Evagr. ii. 4.

^a Hard. ii. 68.

^b Ib. 69.

for an uproar. The Egyptian party protested that to admit him, "the master of Nestorius," would be against the faith and the canons—that it would be a betrayal of Christ and a driving out of St. Cyril. They shouted, "Away with the Jew, the blasphemer, the Nestorian!" while their opponents, with equal zeal, exclaimed that Dioscorus should rather be ejected with his train of Manichæans and murderers; so that the commissioners felt it necessary to remind the bishops of the decency due to their own character. Theodoret was allowed to take his seat—not, however, as a judge but as a plaintiff; and the reading of the Ephesian acts was resumed.^c While it was proceeding, Juvenal of Jerusalem, with the bishops of Palestine, left the position which they had taken up near the Egyptians, and removed to the opposite side of the church. Other bishops, who at Ephesus had acted with Dioscorus, followed, and were hailed by the Orientals with shouts of "Welcome, Orthodox!"^d Even four of the Alexandrian primate's suffragans were among the deserters, and at last he was left with only thirteen Egyptian bishops to support him.^e But he continued to bear himself with unabated pride and with undaunted resolution. He demanded that his case should not be separated from that of the others who had shared in his proceedings; he often, with bitter sarcasm, denounced the tergiversation of his former allies;^f he criticised the evidence with watchful acuteness; he told the members of the council that, in condemning him, they would condemn Athanasius, Gregory of Nazianzum, Cyril, and all the orthodox fathers.^g He said that he acknowledged Christ to be "*of* two natures," but, on being pressed, he declined to use the form "*in* two natures;" thus refusing to own that the distinction of natures had subsisted after the incarnation. He protested that he cared for nothing but God and his own soul.^h

Throughout the day there were continual bursts of uproar, as passages occurred in the acts which excited the feelings of the hostile parties. Mutual anathemas were shouted forth against the asserters and the deniers of the two natures; the descriptions of the scene might recall to our minds the tempests of modern republican assemblies rather than the ideal which we might have naturally formed of the Church's greatest General Council.

It was late before the reading of the first day's proceedings at Ephesus was finished. The commissioners then said that it was

^c Hard. ii. 73; Tillém. xv. 648-650.

^d Hard. ii. 129.

^e Tillém. xv. 651-2.

^f Hard. ii. 80.

^g Ib. 132.

^h Ib. ii. 136.

enough for one day to have cleared the memory of Flavian and Eusebius ; that the emperor was resolved to adhere to the faith of Nicæa and Constantinople ; that, if he agreed in their view of the matter, the leaders in the proceedings at Ephesus ought to be deposed ; but that they left the decision to the consideration of the bishops.¹

Dioscorus was committed to a guard, probably from an apprehension that he might secretly leave Chalcedon. At the third session of the council he was cited, but refused to appear, Oct. 13. on the plea that he was under restraint ; and when informed that he was at liberty to attend the council, he renewed his refusal on other grounds—especially that the imperial commissioners were not then present in the assembly.^k Additional charges were preferred against him—chiefly affecting his administration of his office, and his private morals, which were so notoriously bad as even to afford themes for the ballad-singers of Alexandria ;¹ and, after he had been thrice summoned without appearing, the legates pronounced their sentence,—that, because of the misdemeanours proved against him (among which they included some which do not appear to have been mentioned in the previous proceedings)—for his behaviour at Ephesus, for having dared to excommunicate “the most holy and most blessed archbishop of the great Rome, Leo,”^m and for having disregarded the citations of the council, they, in the name of the Roman bishop and of St. Peter, with the council, declared him to be deprived of all sacerdotal office and dignity.ⁿ Anatolius and other bishops gave their judgment in succession, and the condemnation was signed by about three hundred members of the council. Some of these specified particular charges as the grounds of their assent ; many rested it on the contempt with which Dioscorus had treated the citations (and this was the main reason assigned in the notification of the sentence to himself) ;^o but the majority were content with professing to be guided by the

¹ Hard. ii. 272-3 ; Evagr. iv. 4.

^k Labb. iv. 383-6.

¹ Evagr. ii. 4 ; Hard. ii. 327, 336 ; Walch, vi. 349-354 ; Gibbon, iv. 355.

^m Hard. ii. 324. Baronius (449. 168) places this excommunication at Alexandria, soon after the Latrocinium. Tillemont (xv. 203) rightly says that it was at Nicæa, but supposes it to have been pronounced during some visit to that city before Easter, 450. There is, however, no record of any such visit, and it is in itself improbable. Pagi (viii. 47), with great probability, thinks

that the excommunication was uttered while Dioscorus and others were waiting at Nicæa for the opening of the Council. Tillemont argues that Dioscorus was not then strong enough to venture on such an act. But the question is not whether he was strong enough to give effect to his excommunication, but whether he was bold enough and desperate enough to pronounce it. Walch (vi. 291-2) is undecided.

ⁿ Hard. ii. 345 ; Evagr. ii. 4.

^o Hard. ii. 377.

opinion of the council, and very few made any reference to imputations on the faith of the accused. The condemnation was ratified by the emperor, and Dioscorus was banished to Gangra, in Paphlagonia, where he died in 454.^p

Leo had sent his Letter to Flavian to the council, and it had also been recommended to the attention of the members by Mar-
cian; but, while the pope wished it to be received as a standard of doctrine on the Incarnation, the emperor regarded it as a document subject to examination and discussion,^q and was resolved that the faith should be settled by the authority of the council, not by the bishop of Rome.^r His commissioners, therefore, proposed at the second session that a definition as to October 10.
the faith should be set forth. Cecropius of Sebastopolis and others demurred; the faith, they said, had already been secured by the creeds of Nicæa and Constantinople, and by the Letter to Flavian.^s These documents, and Cyril's second letter to Nestorius, were then generally signed; but the commissioners, resolved on carrying out their instructions, desired the bishops to adjourn for five days, and in the meantime to confer on the subject of a decree as to faith.^t

At the fourth session (the deposition of Dioscorus having taken place at the third), the commissioners again urged their proposal. The legates repeated the objection which had October 17.
been already made—that the Letter to Flavian and the creeds were sufficient. The members of the council were then individually asked whether the Letter were agreeable to the earlier documents, and replied that it was so.^u The thirteen Egyptian bishops, who had adhered to Dioscorus, entreated that they might not be required to subscribe the letter while the see of Alexandria was vacant; such, they said, was their subjection to their patriarch, that, if they should take it upon themselves to sign, their lives would not be safe on their return to Egypt. The commissioners interceded for them, and, after a warm discussion, they were allowed to remain at Constantinople until a new patriarch should be appointed.^x At this meeting the bishops unanimously requested that Juvenal of Jerusalem, and the other metropolitans who had shared in the proceedings of the Latrocinium, should be pardoned, on the ground that they had acted under constraint. The

^p Evagr. ii. 4; Schröckh, xviii. 476.

^q Walch, vi. 327-8.

^r Ib. 445.

^s Hard. ii. 284-5.

^t Ib. 309; Tillem. xv. 656-8.

^u Hard. ii. 386, 413.

^x Ib. 413-420.

request was referred to the emperor, and, with his assent, the desired forgiveness was granted.^y

At the fifth session, a decree as to faith was produced, and was received with various expressions of feeling.^z But in the
 October 22. most critical point, instead of stating that Christ is "*in* two natures," it used the expression "*of* two natures." As Dioscorus had deposed Flavian for the doctrine conveyed in the former phrase, and had himself declared his willingness to agree to the other, the definition (which had probably been framed in accordance with the emperor's wish to conciliate the Egyptian and monastic party)^a was obviously insufficient. The legates said that, unless the words were brought into agreement with Leo's letter, they would return to Rome, and refer the matter to a Western council. On this there were loud outcries against Nestorianism. The great body of the bishops exclaimed that the decree was dictated by the Holy Spirit, and must not be altered.^b In answer to a remark by a commissioner, that Dioscorus had deposed Flavian for using the words "*in* two natures," Anatolius observed that Dioscorus had not been deposed for heresy, but for his excommunication of Leo and for his disobedience to the council's citations.^c The emperor was consulted as to the course which should be taken, and suggested that a committee of bishops should confer with Anatolius and the Roman legates. The general feeling of the assembly was still against any further discussion; there were exclamations that those who did not like the definition might "go off to Rome;" but, on being reminded by the commissioners that Dioscorus had consented to the words "*of* two natures," and asked whether they preferred Dioscorus or Leo, the bishops agreed to reconsider the matter.^d Thus the decree was at length brought into its present form. It confirms the creeds of Nicæa and Constantinople, and the decisions of the general council of Ephesus; it adopts Leo's letter to Flavian as a bulwark alike against Nestorianism and the opposite error; and while recognising the sufficiency of the existing creeds, it defines, in opposition to the recent heresies, that Christ is "perfect alike in Godhead and in manhood; very God and very man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh; coessential with the Father as to his Godhead, and coessential with us as to his manhood; like to us in all things except sin one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, only-begotten, to be acknowledged

^y Hard. ii. 413.

^z Ib. 448; Tillem. xv. 677-8.

^a See Dorner, ii. 121-7.

^b Hard. ii. 447.

^c Ib. 449. See Walch, vi. 428-430.

^d Hard. ii. 449; Neand. iv. 226.

in two natures,^e without confusion, change, division, or separation; the difference of the natures being in nowise taken away by reason of their union, but rather the properties of each nature being preserved, and concurring into one person and one hypostasis, not as it were divided or separated into two persons, but one and the same Son and only-begotten, God the Word.”^f

At the next (6th) session, Marcian and the empress^g appeared, and were received by the bishops with loud acclamations, mixed with anathemas against Nestorius, Eutyches, and Dioscorus. The emperor made a speech, and gave his sanction to the definition of faith, and the document was generally subscribed.^h

October 25.

Theodoret signed the decree as bishop of Cyrus, but had not yet been restored to his see. Although the Roman recognition of him had been mentioned in the council, the fathers in the eighth session proceeded to an independent examination of his case.ⁱ He was received with violent outcries from many of the bishops, and was called on to anathematize Nestorius. He attempted to state his faith, declaring that the recovery of his bishoprick was nothing to him in comparison of his reputation for orthodoxy. But the bishops would not listen to any explanation; and at length, after many vain attempts to overcome their clamour, he pronounced an anathema on Nestorius, with all who refuse the word *Theotokos*, or divide the two natures; whereupon he was acknowledged as orthodox and worthy of his see.^k It might have been supposed that Theodoret intended his anathema against the errors which were popularly imputed to Nestorius, without implying that the imputation was just; but, if the notice of Nestorius in one of his latest works be genuine, it would appear that he had changed his opinion as to the heresiarch himself.^l Ibas was also,

October 26.

^e The Greek reads *ἐκ δύο φύσεων*—“of two natures.” But it is generally agreed that this is a mistake. Evagrius (ii. 4. p. 291) and the Latin version have “in two natures;” and, after the previous discussions, it would seem that these words must have been in the decree, either instead of, or (as Dr. Routh thinks, *Scriptorum Eccles. Opuscula*, ii. 119) together with “of two natures.” See Tillem. xv. 681; Gieseler, I. ii. 161; note in Fleury, iii. 373; and compare the Sixth General Council, in Hard. iii. 1400. Dorner, however, maintains the reading *ἐκ*, and thinks that it substantially conveys the same idea as *ἐκ*—monophysitism being excluded by other words of the decree (“Christus ist aus zwei Naturen als Sohn zu erkennen”=

“Christus ist als Sohn in zwei Naturen zu erkennen”). ii. 129.

^f Hard. ii. 452-6; Routh, *Script. Eccles. Opusc.* ii. 75-80.

^g Hard. ii. 463; Evagr. ii. 4. Tillem. (xv. 920) and Pagi (in Bar. viii. 31) argue that the statement as to Pulcheria is incorrect. But see Walch, vi. 404; Schröckh, xviii. 482; and note in Fleury, iii. 374.

^h Hard. ii. 463-488.

ⁱ Ib. 497; Walch, vi. 439.

^k Hard. ii. 497-500; Pagi, viii. 106-7; Tillem. xv. 308-9, 603-4.

^l “Ad Sporacium, contra Nestorium,” t. iv. 696-702, which is in great part the same with Hæret. Fabul. iv. 12. The genuineness of both is questioned by Garnier (ap. Theod. v. 250, seqq.) and

not without some difficulty, restored to the bishoprick of Edessa.^m

The number of the council's sessions is variously reckoned, from twelve to fifteen.ⁿ Among its acts were two important regulations on the subject of ecclesiastical precedence and jurisdiction.

(1.) Agreeably to the principle of correspondence between the ecclesiastical and the civil divisions,^o Palestine had been subject to the bishop of Cæsarea, the civil capital, as metropolitan. Jerusalem was but an ordinary bishoprick; yet, on account of the sacred associations connected with the place, it always enjoyed something of a peculiar reverence.^p This undefined honour had been formally sanctioned by the seventh Nicene canon, on the ground of "custom and ancient tradition;" and the importance of the Holy City had since been increased by the growing practice of pilgrimage, which drew to it a vast confluence of visitors from all countries to which the Gospel had penetrated. Juvenal conceived the ambitious idea of not only freeing himself from the superiority of Cæsarea, but, raising his see to the dignity of a patriarchate. His first attempt was made at the general council of Ephesus, where the bishop of Cæsarea was absent, while John of Antioch, to whom both Cæsarea and Jerusalem were perhaps subject,^q was obnoxious as the chief of the rival assembly. Relying on these favourable circumstances, Juvenal went so far as to assert that Antioch ought to be directed and judged by Jerusalem; but his pretensions were checked by Cyril, and were not revived until after the Alexandrian bishop's death.^r At the *Latrocinium*, where he was again favoured by the absence of the bishop of Cæsarea, and by the position of the Syrian patriarch Domnus, Juvenal renewed his claims; and he had subsequently obtained rescripts in his favour from the emperor.^s The question now came before the council for final decision; Maximus, of Antioch, al-

others, and is maintained by Neander, iv. 229-231. See Dupin, iv. 103-5; Tillem. xv. 621; Schröckh, xviii. 11, 366-9, 374-5. It is not certain whether Theodoret resumed his see or remained in his monastery, devoting himself to literary labour. He is supposed to have died about 457-8. Pagi, viii. 149-151; Dupin, iv. 85; Tillem. xv. 310-2, 875.

^m Hard. ii. 504-544.

ⁿ Tillem. xv. 713; Schröckh, xviii. 482.

^o See p. 159.

^p Thomassin, I. i. 12; Tillem. xiv. 451-3; xv. 198-9; Bingham, II. xvi. 11. Against Blondel's notion that it was exempt from the jurisdiction of Cæsarea, see Tillem. xv. 200-1.

^q Döllinger (i. 203) and Wiltsch (i. 204), however, think that the bishop of Cæsarea was probably autocephalous.

^r Hard. i. 1489; Cyrill. Epp. p. 191; Tillem. xiv. 453; xv. 202-3. Cyril drew Rome into opposing Juvenal's attempts. Leo, Ep. cxix. 4.

^s Labbe, iv. 618; Tillem. xv. 204.

though dissatisfied with the change, was disposed to agree to a compromise; and the council, at its seventh session, assigned to Juvenal the dignity of a patriarch,^t with jurisdiction over Palestine, while Arabia and the second Phœnicia, which had been included in Juvenal's claim, were left to the patriarch of Antioch, and the bishop of Cæsarea was allowed to retain the title of an *honorary metropolitan*.^u

(2.) The twenty-eighth canon related to the see of Constantinople. The eastern emperors had found it their interest to exalt the bishop of their capital, in opposition to the power of metropolitans on the one hand, and of the Roman bishop on the other.^v And the dignity and influence of the position had been continually increasing. An introduction by the bishop of Constantinople was necessary for such of his brethren as desired to be admitted into the imperial presence.^x He presided over the "Home Synod," a body composed of such bishops as had been drawn by their affairs to the residence of the court, and to which the emperors were accustomed to refer appeals in ecclesiastical matters.^y Although the canon of the Second General Council, which placed Constantinople next to Rome, did not bestow on it any jurisdiction, the bishops attempted to exercise patriarchal authority over Thrace, Asia, and Pontus;^z they claimed the right, not only of ordaining, but even of nominating, the metropolitans and inferior bishops of these provinces;^a they even extended their interference into the patriarchate of Antioch, and became the general referees and arbitrators of the eastern Church.^b

The twenty-eighth canon of Chalcedon was intended as a compromise of the differences which had arisen from these pretensions. It ordered that the metropolitans only of the three dioceses should be ordained by the patriarchs of Constantinople, and that after a certificate of regular and undisputed election by their own suffragans.^c The canon recognised the privileges bestowed by the Second General Council on "New Rome;" it referred these to

^u Socrates is the earliest writer who uses this title in its modern sense. The Council of Chalcedon is the first ecclesiastical authority for it. Bingham, II. xvii. 6.

^v Labbe, iv. 611-8; Tillem. xv. 203-5, 686.

^w Gieseler, I. ii. 189.

^x Planck, i. 617-8.

^y Tillem. xv. 703-4; Walch, vi. 145; note in Fleury, iii. 406.

^z Schröckh, xvii. 27. Chrysostom's intervention at Ephesus had been re-

quested; but other bishops of Constantinople interfered of their own motion. (Wiltch, i. 140-2.) Noel Alexandre, however, argues that the jurisdiction was conferred by the Second General Council. viii. 182-9.

^a Tillem. xv. 704.

^b Ib. 703-6.

^c By bestowing the privilege of ordaining metropolitans on one patriarch, the council is to be understood as giving it to all—whereas it had before belonged to the suffragan bishops. Planck, i. 611.

the secular eminence of the city, declared that the privileges of the ancient capital itself rested on like grounds, and enacted that Constantinople ought "to be magnified in ecclesiastical matters even like the elder imperial Rome, as being next to it."^d The canon was signed by about a hundred and eighty bishops—many of those who supposed themselves to be aggrieved by it standing aloof. On the following day, which was the last of the Nov. 1. council, the Roman legates protested against it, as having been passed in their absence, and through a surprise practised on those who had been present. The charge of surprise was denied by the parties concerned; and the legates were reminded that they had been summoned to the meeting of the preceding day. They threatened to report the matter to their master; to which the commissioners replied by calmly telling them that it had been decided by the synod.^e

The emperor followed up the council by laws against the Eutychians,^f forbidding them to hold meetings, to ordain clergy, and to build churches or monasteries, and inflicting various disabilities on them.^g Leo, on receiving a report of the proceedings, expressed high approval of the decree as to faith, but no less indignation against the twenty-eighth canon. With a bold disregard of history,^h he denied that the precedence of sees had depended on the importance of the cities in which they were. He asserted that the canon of the Second Council had never been acted on or notified to the Roman see,ⁱ although (besides other instances to the contrary) his own legates at the Latrocinium had made no objection to the position assigned under that canon to Flavian. He pretended that the new canon contradicted the Nicene Council by subjecting Alexandria and Antioch to Constantinople; and he declared it to be annulled by the authority of St. Peter. He loudly complained of the ambition of Anatolius,^k whom he charged with ingratitude for the

^d Hard. ii. 611-4.

^e Ib. 625-644; Tillem. xv. 711-3; Schröckh, xvii. 29-30. Tillemont (xv. 709-711) thinks that the assuming behaviour of the legates may have disposed the bishops to pass the canon, with a view of setting up a rival to Rome.

^f These laws show that the party was strong, not only among monks, but among the soldiery. (Hard. ii. 677; Walch, vi. 479.) Eutyches himself did not appear at Chalcedon, and was not noticed by the Council—probably because such notice was unnecessary, as

Flavian's proceedings were vindicated. In 454, Leo suggested to Marcian that the heretic ought to be sent to a greater distance from Constantinople. (Ep. cxxxiv. 2.) The result is not known; but it is supposed that Eutyches died soon after. Bar. 454. 10; Tillem. xv. 722; Walch, vi. 415-7, 480-1.

^g Cod. Just. I. v. 8; Hard. ii. 659-664, 676-680; Baron. 452. 3-5.

^h See Tillem. xv. 190.

ⁱ Ep. cvi. 5.

^k Anatolius (ap. Leon. Ep. cxxxii. 4) says that his character was not ambi-

favour shown by the Roman acknowledgment of him; he suspended intercourse with him, and threatened to excommunicate him.¹ Finding, however, that, although it was the interest of both Marcian and the patriarch to be on friendly terms with Rome, his lofty pretensions had no effect on them, he affected, in 454, to regard some conciliatory words of Anatolius as a retractation of the conduct which had offended him; and the patriarch of Constantinople was readmitted to his correspondence.^m And, although some of the more extravagant Romish historians profess to suppose that Marcian abrogated the canon by an imaginary law, it is certain that from the time of its enactment it was steadily executed by the Eastern court.ⁿ

II. The canon in favour of Constantinople agreed with the tendency of the age to centre authority in the great sees by overpowering the independence of the lesser.^o In the same spirit which led the patriarchs of Constantinople to extend their jurisdiction over the neighbouring provinces, Alexander of Antioch had endeavoured, in the earlier part of the century, to assert a claim to the island of Cyprus, which had until then been *autocephalous*^p under its metropolitan, the bishop of Constantia or Salamis. He pretended that it had been originally subject to Antioch, but had withdrawn itself in the course of the preceding century, on account of the heresy and schism by which the mother church had then been distracted, and which it had been reserved for Alexander himself finally to suppress.^q The claim, however, failed; the council of Ephesus—perhaps in some degree influenced by enmity against John, the successor of Alexander,—pronounced it inconsistent with the canons of Nicæa.^r But the dignity of the patriarchs generally had been on the increase. In some cases, they assisted bishops to obtain the title of metropolitans, on condition of subordination to themselves; sometimes they commissioned existing metropolitans to act as their vicars—an arrangement by which the metropolitan acquired an increase of power, but paid for it by the forfeiture of his independence.^s

The growth of the Roman influence during the earlier half of the fifth century was especially remarkable. As in the preceding

tious, and that his clergy were the real movers in the affair. But Leo will not admit the excuse. Ep. cxxxv. 3.

¹ Ep. 104-7, etc.

^m Ep. 134; Tillem. xv. 729-730, 772.

ⁿ Tillem. xv. 729-730; Schröckh,

xvii. 43-5; xviii. 491; Gieseler, I. ii. 228.

^o Schröckh, viii. 136.

^p Literally "self-headed."

^q Innocent. Ep. xxiv. 3 (Patrol. xx.); Thomassin, I. i. 18. 1. See p. 381.

^r Hard. i. 1617-20; Tillem. xiv. 444-7.

^s Planck, i. 619-620.

century, controversies continued to arise in the East. From Chrysostom and Theophilus to Dioscorus and Anatolius, the great bishops were divided by enmities, and one of them after another was charged with heresy. In such circumstances they were driven to look towards Rome, not only as the principal Church of the West, but as representative of all the rest. Antioch and Alexandria were especially interested in courting its alliance, as a counterpoise to the new importance of Constantinople.^t The Roman bishops affected to regard such applications as appeals; while those who received favourable answers from Rome were eager to magnify them as authoritative judgments.^u The dignity of the Roman see rose in the eyes of men, through the exemption of its bishops from that personal share in the disputes, the intrigues, the scandals and calamities of the time which degraded the estimation of the Eastern patriarchs; through the circumstance that, instead of engaging in the altercations of councils, they were represented in those assemblies by envoys, who studiously held up the name of Rome as if it were entitled to overawe the whole hierarchy of the church.^x By the withdrawal of the western emperors to Milan and Ravenna, the bishops were left as the chief resident personages of Rome; and both the decay of the empire and the personal feebleness of the princes contributed to the advancement of the ecclesiastical power. Thus favoured by circumstances, the bishops of Rome, with growing pretensions and various fortunes, pushed onwards to that ascendancy which their successors were destined in time to attain.

The Roman bishops had before denied that their precedence originated in the secular greatness of the city, and had professed to trace it to their alleged succession from St. Peter. This theory, in truth, resolves itself into the other; and, if there were room for doubt as to the reason why the first of the Apostles may be supposed to have fixed his see in the capital of the civilised world, the question would be decided by the fact that the other churches which traced themselves to him were those of the two cities which came next in importance to Rome; and, further, that in ecclesiastical as well as in civil rank Alexandria took precedence of Antioch, although the foundation of the Egyptian see was referred to the agency of a disciple, whereas the Syrian was believed to have been founded by the Apostle himself.^y The derivation from

^t Mosh. i. 437-8.

^u Planck, i. 635; Gieseler, I. ii. 200; Neand. iii. 242-3.

^x See Milman, *Lat. Christ.* i. 212.

^y For attempts to get over this inversion of the order which the Roman

St. Peter was, however, advanced as if it excluded the view which it thus really involves; and the claims founded on it became continually higher. For a time, it was said that the prerogatives of Rome had been *bestowed* on it by the fathers, out of reverence for the chief of the Apostles.^z But afterwards it was asserted that they were *inherent* in the Roman see—a doctrine which was hinted at by Cœlestine's legates in the council of Ephesus, but was first broadly maintained by Léo.^a

Innocent went beyond his predecessors in his assumptions. He laboured earnestly to subject independent metropolitans. A.D. 402— Carrying out an usurpation which appears to have been 417. begun by Siricius,^b he assumed jurisdiction over the churches of Eastern Illyricum, and constituted the bishop of Thessalonica his vicar for the administration of that vast province—extending from Cape Tænarus to the Danube.^c He laid down the principle that the whole Western Church was bound to conform to the usages of Rome^d—a principle which so lately as the time of St. Ambrose had been utterly disallowed.^e The lofty language of this bishop in receiving a communication from the Africans in the matter of Pelagius, the pretensions of his successor Zosimus in the same case, and the defeat of the latter in respect both of fact and of right, have already been mentioned.^f Yet in that affair, Zosimus, although with little credit to himself, made an important step towards increasing the authority of his see; for his circular letter—the expression, not of his first independent opinion, but of that which had been forced on him—was the earliest instance in which a document emanating from Rome was proposed for general adoption as a standard of orthodoxy.^g

theory would require, see Thomassin, I. i. 8. 6. Innocent says that Antioch received its dignity “non tam pro civitatis magnificentia, quam quod prima primi Apostoli sedes esse monstretur.” Ep. xxiv. 1.

^z Conc. Sardic. A.D. 347, c. 3; Zosimus, Ep. ii. 1 (Patrol. xx.); Valent. III., inter epp. Leonis, 55 (ib. liv. 859); Giesel. I. ii. 208-9.

^a Hard. i. 1477; Giesel. I. ii. 213.

^b Siric. Ep. 4 (Patrol. xiii. 1148). See Thomassin, I. i. 18; Schröckh, viii. 113-5.

^c Ep. 13 (Patrol. xx.). Theodosius II., in 421, at the request of the Illyrian bishops, ordered that the province should be subject to the see of Constantinople, “which rejoices in the prerogative of old Rome;” but, by desire of Honorius, he restored it to Rome. Inter Epp.

Bonifac. 9-11 (ib.).

^d Ep. 25, ad Decentium. Yet he seems to limit his claim by going on to say that the *western* countries had been evangelized by St. Peter's emissaries, and on this account especially (*præsertim*) ought to follow the Roman example. See Schröckh, viii. 130, 136-8; Binde-mann's Augustinus, i. 225-6.

^e “In omnibus cupio sequi ecclesiam Romanam; sed tamen et nos homines sensum habemus; ideo quod alibi rectius servatur, et nos rectius custodimus” (Ambr. de Sacramentis, iii. 1). Compare Jerome—“*Unaquæque provincia abundet in sensu suo, et præcepta majorum leges Apostolicas arbitretur*” (Ep. lxxi. 6); and Augustine, Epp. 36, 54.

^f Pp. 416-8.

^g Pagi, vii. 173; Neand. iii. 241; Giesel. I. ii. 201-2.

The Africans, although desirous of Innocent's co-operation in the Pelagian controversy, entirely maintained their independence of him.^h In like manner, when an African presbyter named Apiarius appealed to Rome, during the episcopate of Zosimus, the African bishops denied that appeals from Carthage might be made to churches beyond the seas, since such appeals had been forbidden by the Council of Nicæa and in the African code.ⁱ Zosimus, however, claimed the right of entertaining appeals, by virtue (as he asserted) of a Nicene canon.^k The Africans heard of this authority with surprise, as no such canon was known to them. They sent to the Eastern patriarchs for authentic copies of the

Nicene code, and, in notifying this step to Boniface, A.D. 419. who in the mean time had succeeded Zosimus, they expressed a hope that they might no longer have cause to complain of the secular pride and arrogance of Rome.^l The canon proved to be one, not of the Nicene, but of the Sardican council,^m and Zosimus had moreover stretched it far beyond its real meaning.ⁿ

About A.D. 424-6. Apiarius again appealed to Rome in the time of Cœlestine; when the African bishops altogether refused to admit any interference of foreign churches with the affairs of their province, and declared the holding of an opposite opinion to be a ground for excommunication.^o

Among the attempts of Cœlestine to extend the power of his see, his assumption of the right to depose a bishop of Constantinople was the most unprecedented and startling. But the course of affairs prevented any result from this assumption, as the execution of Cœlestine's mandate was superseded by the summoning of a General Council, and at that assembly Nestorius was deposed, not by the authority of the Roman letter, but after an examination of his case by the bishops who were present.^p

The chief promoter of the Roman power in this period was the A.D. 440- second successor of Cœlestine,—Leo, who, in later 461. times, has been styled "the Great." This bishop employed in pursuit of his object extraordinary genius, political skill,

^h Schröckh, viii. 141.

ⁱ See Tillemont, xiii. 775, seqq.; Hussey, 41.

^k Hard. i. 1242.

^l Ib. 939, seqq.; 1243, seqq.; Tillem. xii. 385; xiii. 775-780, 783-4; Gieseler, I. ii. 222; Hussey, 47.

^m Conc. Sardic. A.D. 347, c. 14. Gr. c. 17. Lat.

ⁿ See Hussey, 49-52. Baronius is very amusing on this affair. See espe-

cially 419. 87.

^o This had been already declared by African councils—"ad transmarina qui putaverit appellandum, &c." See Hard. i. 879, 1221. How entirely the principle was regarded as settled, may appear from St. Augustine, Ep. xliii. 14.

^p Field, iii. 272-3; Barrow, 221; Tillem. xiv. 364. See above, pp. 442-7.

^q See Tillem. xv. 829.

and theological learning. He raised the claims of the Roman bishop, as the representative of St. Peter, to a height before unknown. With the utter defiance of historical fact which afterwards became characteristic of his successors and their advocates, he declared the pretensions and the practices of his Church to be matter of unbroken apostolical tradition—ascribing that venerable character to regulations introduced within the preceding half-century by Siricius, and even by still more recent bishops.^r Under such pretences he endeavoured to enforce the usages of Rome as a rule for the universal church; even telling Dioscorus, before their disagreement, that Alexandria ought to follow the Roman model, and giving as his reason, that it would be impious^s to suppose the disciple St. Mark to have varied from the rules laid down by St. Peter.

In the earlier years of his episcopate Leo exerted himself against various kinds of heretics, as the Pelagians, the Manichæans (of whom many had been driven to Rome by the troubles of Africa, and who appear to have been convicted of gross depravity, as well as of errors in opinion)^t and the Priscillianists, who were still a considerable party in Spain. As to these last it is to be noted that he expressly approved the execution of their founder, which, sixty years earlier, had excited the general disgust and indignation of the orthodox.^u

The calamities of the age removed from the path of Roman ambition the hindrance which had been opposed by the independent Church of Africa,—a church distinguished far beyond Rome itself by the services which its members had rendered to theology and learning. The Africans, oppressed by the Arian invaders of their country, were glad to seek support from a connexion with Rome; and the interference which had been boldly rejected in the days of Zosimus, was admitted, without objection, at the hands of the later bishop.^x Leo extended his sway over Spain and Sicily,^y and in Gaul he interfered in a remarkable manner, with gross injustice to one of the most eminent men of the age.

Hilary, a monk of Lerins, had at the age of twenty-eight been obliged reluctantly to accept the metropolitan see of Arles, as successor to his former abbot Honoratus, by A.D. 429.

^r Tillem. xv. 418-9. Leo repeated, in more than one instance, the attempt to pass off a Sardican for a Nicene canon—notwithstanding the exposure of the imposture in the case of Zosimus. Tillem. xv. 595-7; Hussey, 60, 67.

^s "Nefas," Ep. 9.

^t Epp. 7-8; Baron. 443. 1-7, 444. 1-7; Schröckh, xviii. 61-4.

^u Ep. 15, init. See above, p. 288.

^x Tillem. xv. 423; Schröckh, xvii. 133; Gieselser, I. ii. 226.

^y Schröckh, xvii. 150.

whom he had been designated for the office.^z He became famous for his learning; for his zeal in executing discipline without respect of persons; for his charity towards the poor and captives; and for his unwearied labours and exertions in all the episcopal duties.^a Such was his eloquence that his Lenten discourses, of four hours in length, were listened to with unflagging attention, although bodily weakness obliged the hearers to introduce the novelty of sitting while he preached, instead of standing, as had been usual during the delivery of sermons.^b

The sees of Arles and Vienne had formerly contended for precedence, and Zosimus had, in 417, given a decision in favour of Arles, on the ground that it had been founded by Trophimus, the Ephesian, who (he said) had been sent into Gaul by St. Peter.^c Hilary, at a synod held in 444, deposed a bishop named Celidonius, who thereupon complained to Leo that the bishop of Arles had exceeded his jurisdiction. Such an application could not but be welcome to Leo, since it furnished him with an opportunity for extending his power under the pretext of defending the Gaulish bishops from oppression.^d Hilary did not acknowledge any right in the Roman bishop to receive such appeals; he made his way to the capital on foot, in the middle of winter, for the purpose of asserting his independence; and, in consequence of the unsatisfactory nature of his communications with Leo, he left Rome secretly and returned to his diocese.^e But Leo, with his usual boldness, declared that the apostolic see had *always* been accustomed to receive appeals from Gaul. He restored Celidonius; he pronounced a sentence depriving Hilary of the power to hold synods—a power which he represented as depending on a commission from Rome;^f and he procured from Valentinian a very remarkable law, which is supposed to have been dictated by himself.

A.D. 445.

In this the emperor, after magnifying the privileges of the Roman see, censures Hilary for his insubordination; he declares the bishop of Rome to be rightful ruler of the whole Church; he orders that no bishop, in Gaul or elsewhere, shall make any innovation on ancient custom; that the appointments of the Roman bishop shall be obeyed as laws by all others; and that any bishop who shall neglect a citation to the tribunal of the bishop of Rome,

^z The choice is said to have been confirmed by the descent of a dove on Hilary's head. Vita, c. 6 (Patrol. l.).

^a Gennadius, 71.

^b Vita, 11; Augusti, vi. 337.

^c Zosim. Epp. 3-5 (Patrol. xx.); Conc. Taurin. c. 2, ap. Hard. i. 958; Schröckh,

viii. 147-152; xvii. 138-9; Gieseler, I. ii. 217-9; Wiltseh, i. 97-9.

^d Ampère, ii. 74.

^e Vita, 16-7.

^f Ep. 10; Pagi, vii. 584; Tillem. xv. 60-80; Schröckh, xvii. 139-147; Neander, iii. 245-7; Gieseler, iii. 220-1.

shall be forcibly compelled to appear by the civil governor of his province.^g This unexampled law, however, was not universally obeyed, and Hilary appears to have retained his dignity until his death, four years later; after which Leo, at the request of the Gaulish bishops, settled the rivalry of Arles and Vienne by a division of jurisdiction.^h

The power of assembling general councils was not yet claimed by the bishops of Rome, but was supposed to belong to the emperors.ⁱ The Council of Chalcedon, as we have seen, was summoned against the will of Leo, and in many respects it thwarted his wishes and disallowed his pretensions; yet in the event it contributed greatly towards the realization of his schemes. It was at Chalcedon that the legates of Rome for the first time obtained the presidency of a general council,—a position which could hardly have been refused to them when the dissensions of the eastern patriarchs had compelled the emperor to rely so largely on the orthodoxy and the judgment of the Roman bishop. The patriarch of Constantinople, indeed, was joined with them in the presidency, while both he and they had no privileges beyond other members of the Council, and were subject to the control of the imperial commissioners; but the part which the legates took in the assembly was afterwards greatly magnified by Leo, who usually spoke of them as having judicially decided matters respecting which they had only given their opinion, and of which the decision had been pronounced by the voice of the Council at large;^k and the adoption of the letter to Flavian, as a standard of doctrine on the Incarnation (although it was not received in submission to Leo, but was subjected to the examination of the Council^l), must have contributed

^g Leo, Ep. 11, seu Constit. Valent.; De Marca, I. viii. 2-3; Schröckh, xvii. 47-9, 148; Planck, i. 642-650; Gieseler, I. ii. 226; Hussey, 63-4. Baronius exults in this law (445. 9). Tillemont (xv. 73) says that, "if we may examine the matter by the lights of history," we shall find Leo's pretensions to be quite unfounded. "Cette loi," he remarks (p. 83), "est très propre, comme dit Baronius, pour faire voir que les empereurs ont beaucoup servi à établir la grandeur et l'autorité des papes. Ce n'est pas ici le lieu d'y faire d'autres réflexions; mais nous ne pouvons pas nous empêcher de dire que dans l'esprit de ceux qui ont quelque amour pour la liberté de l'Eglise, et quelque connois-

sance de sa discipline, elle fera toujours aussi peu d'honneur à celui qu'elle loue que de tort à celui qu'elle condamne." (Comp. pp. 86-7, 441, and Quesnel, Dissert. v. in S. Leon.) Leo's successor Hilary, in dealing with a Gaulish quarrel, cites this law—thereby tacitly admitting that the pretended prerogatives of Rome had no older or higher source (Ep. 11; Patrol. lviii. 30). See Schröckh, xvii. 175.

^h Ep. 66; Pagi, viii. 64; Dupin, iv. 141; Tillem. xv. 84, 93-6.

ⁱ Barrow, 181; Planck, i. 481.

^k Tillem. xv. 644, 662-6; Walch, vi. 408.

^l See note in Fleury, iii. 359.

not a little to exalt the authority of the Roman see in the estimation of Christians generally.

In his later dealings with the Eastern Church, Leo ventured on some remarkable innovations. It had been the practice of the great patriarchs to maintain representatives at Constantinople, for the purpose of watching over their interests in such matters as might be referred to the emperor.^m But whereas these representatives had always been chosen from the lower degrees of the hierarchy, Leo commissioned a bishop to act as his ordinary envoy. Although this bishop, Julian of Cos, belonged to another jurisdiction, Leo authorized him to absent himself from his diocese; and the object of the legation was evidently not so much to guard the interests of Rome as to overlook and coerce the patriarch of Constantinople.ⁿ Leo went so far as to interfere with the internal concerns of that church by remonstrating with Anatolius against certain ordinations and appointments, and exciting the clergy of the eastern capital to control their bishop in the administration of his office.^o It was natural that Anatolius should resent such interference,^p and a violent collision appeared to be inevitable; when the death of the patriarch, in 458, prevented the further progress of the quarrel.^q

We need not question that Leo conscientiously believed himself to be acting for the benefit, not of his own see only, but of the whole Church. But neither respect for his great merits nor charity in the construction of his motives must be allowed to blind us to his ambition and love of domination. In him we for the first time meet with something approaching to the papacy of later times; the conception is, in the main, already formed, although as yet but imperfectly realised.^r

A circumstance of different tendency must be mentioned before leaving this subject. After the death of Zosimus, in December, 418, the possession of the see of Rome was for a time fiercely contested between Boniface and Eulalius, each of whom was consecrated by his partisans. Boniface was at length established by the emperor Honorius, who, apparently at the bishop's request, enacted that, when two persons should be chosen for the see of Rome, a new

^m Baron. 453. 9, and Pagi's note.

ⁿ Tillem. xv. 760-1; Dupin, iv. 145,

seqq.

^o Epp. 111-3, 151, 155, 157, 161, &c.

^p Leo, Ep. 163.

^q Tillem. xv. 757-760, 802-811.

^r Planck, i. 661-2; Ampère, ii. 84. Barrow somewhere styles Leo a "*vixently* pope."

election should take place. And this was the origin of the important influence which temporal princes afterwards exercised in the election of the Roman bishops.^s

^s Hard. i. 1237-8; Bonif. Epp. 7-8 (Patrol. xx.); Baron. 419; Tillem. xii. 387, seqq.; Schröckh, viii. 154-7. Some curious details of this affair may be found in the epistles of Symmachus, who, although a pagan, and formerly the chosen champion of his religion (see p. 279), found himself obliged, as prefect of Rome, to take a part in moderating the contest for the bishoprick. Epp. x. 71-83 (Patrol. xviii.).

CHAPTER XI.

FALL OF THE WESTERN EMPIRE.—CONVERSION OF THE
BARBARIANS.—VANDAL PERSECUTION IN AFRICA.

I. WITHIN about twenty years from the death of Valentinian III. March 17, the Western Empire had nine sovereigns. The first of
 455. these was Maximus, the senator whose vengeance had been fatal to his predecessor. His wife having died opportunely, he married the widowed empress Eudoxia; but his indiscretion in telling her that for her sake he had instigated the murder of her husband excited her disgust and indignation. In order to obtain revenge, she invited the Vandals from Africa;^a and her invitation was promptly answered. Within less than three months after Valentinian's death, Genseric, whose fleet had long been the terror of the Mediterranean coasts,^b appeared at the mouth of the Tiber. Maximus, in attempting to escape from Rome, was stoned to death
 June 12, by the populace; and three days later the invader was
 455. before the walls. Leo, at the head of his clergy, went forth to confront for the second time a barbarian conqueror;^c he obtained a promise that the city should not be burnt, that the lives of the inhabitants should be spared, and that they should not be tortured for the purpose of discovering their treasures. Thus the bishop's intercession mitigated in some degree the horrors of the sack which followed; but the Vandals for fourteen days gave a loose to their lust and rapacity; and they returned to Africa laden with plunder, and carrying with them a multitude of captives, among whom were Eudoxia and her two daughters.^d The charity of Deogratias, bishop of Carthage, on this occasion, may be related in the words of Gibbon. "He generously sold the gold and silver plate of the Church to purchase the freedom of some, to alleviate the slavery of others, and to assist the wants and infirmities of a captive multitude, whose health was impaired by the hardships which they had suffered in their passage from Italy to Africa. By

^a Procop. de Bello Vandal. i. 4, p. 188.

^b It is said that, when embarking on an expedition, he was asked by his pilot against what nation he intended to sail,

and answered, "Against those with whom God is angry." Ib. 5.

^c See p. 434.

^d Proc. i. 5; Victor Tununensis, in Patrol. lxxviii. 943; Gibbon, iii. 288-291.

his order, two spacious churches were converted into hospitals: the sick were distributed in convenient beds, and liberally supplied with food and medicines; and the aged prelate repeated his visits both in the day and night, with an assiduity that surpassed his strength, and a tender sympathy which enhanced the value of his services. Compare this scene," adds the historian, "with the field of Cannæ, and judge between Hannibal and the successor of St. Cyprian."^e

The loss of Africa involved that of the revenues which the Roman nobles had drawn from their estates in that country, and the cessation of the supplies of corn on which the commonalty in great measure depended for its support.^f With a view of recovering the province, the emperor Majorian, a man of character and energy worthy of a better time, made war on Genseric in 457; and eleven years later, a vast armament, chiefly supplied by the eastern emperor Leo, was sent against the Vandal king: but the first of these expeditions was defeated through the treachery of barbarian allies, and the second through the incapacity of its commander, the emperor's brother-in-law, Basiliscus.^g Britain had already been abandoned by the Romans; Gaul and Spain were gradually occupied by barbarians of various races; and at length the imperial dominion was limited to a portion of the Italian peninsula. The last Emperor of the West, Augustulus, was, in 476,^h compelled to resign his throne, and became a pensioner on the bounty of Odoacer, the first Barbarian king of Italy.ⁱ

II. In connexion with the fall of the Empire, the paganism of the West may be for the last time formally noticed.

Paganism had been combated in the East with severity and success. The younger Theodosius, as we have seen,^k professed to question whether any of his subjects continued to adhere to it; and, somewhat later, he ordered that the remaining temples should be dismantled,^l and purified by the sign of the cross. But in the West the old religion retained its hold longer. In cities, the pagans, when debarred from the public exercise of their worship,

^e Gibbon, iii. 292; Vict. Vitensis, i. 8 (Patrol. lviii.).

^f Gibbon, iii. 287.

^g Proc. de Bello Vandal. i. 6-7; Tillem. Emp. vi. 322, 399-400; Gibbon, iii. 302-9, 318-321.

^h Or 479. Compare Gibbon, iii. 335, with Clinton, A.D. 476.

ⁱ Gibbon, iii. 333-4.

^k P. 370.

^l Cod. Theod. XVI. x. 25. The word is *destrui*, but, as Godefroy observes, the context shows that this can only mean that the temples were to be cleared of idolatrous objects. Godefroy and Clinton give the date 426; Tillemont (Emp. vi. 72) gives 435. See Beugnot, ii. 220-1.

cultivated the household worship of the Lares and Penates, and celebrated their sacrifices privately, notwithstanding the imperial laws.^m And in the country the pagan rites were still performed without disguise, and without molestation on the part of those who were entrusted with the execution of the laws for their suppression.ⁿ Maximus, bishop of Turin, about the middle of the century, remonstrates with Christian landowners for suffering their estates to be defiled with idolatry by the peasants;^o he describes and denounces the superstitious and disorderly celebration of the new year, which Christians had retained from the rites of Janus.^p Leo the Great speaks of some Christians who continued to worship the sun.^q Auguries and other methods of divination continued to be practised.^r While Pagans ascribed the calamities of the Empire to the suppression of their rites, Salvian,^s the Jeremiah of his age (as he has been styled^t), and other Christians, regarded them as chastisements on account of the remains of idolatry which were still tolerated in Gaul, Africa, and elsewhere.^u Pagans are occasionally mentioned as holding important positions in the state; even the emperor Anthemius (A.D. 467-472) is suspected of having favoured the old religion.^v Genseric's expedition against Rome was in one respect favourable to Christianity, inasmuch as, by carrying off a number of statues, and by stripping the Capitol of its thickly-gilt bronze roof, he removed from the sight of the Romans objects which recalled to mind the religion of their forefathers.^x But in the very last years of the century, Gelasius, bishop of Rome, had to argue against the celebration of the Lupercalia, which, although only the lowest of the people took part in it, found apologists among men of senatorial rank.^y

^m Beugnot, ii. 204-8.

ⁿ Maxim. Taurin. Serm. 82 (Patrol. lvii. 693).

^o Ib. Serm. 101-2.

^p Homil. 16, 103; Serm. 6.

^q Serm. xxvii. 4.

^r Salv. vi. 2; Beugnot, ii. 216.

^s Salvian, a presbyter of Marseilles, wrote a book "On the Government of God," with a view of combating the opinion which had grown up among Christians, that the miseries of the time and the sufferings of the good indicated an Epicurean carelessness as to human affairs on the part of the Deity—an opinion which had led many to doubt the profitableness of religion (*De Gubernatione Dei*, i. 1-5; Patrol. liii.). There is, as Niebuhr remarks, a strong republican and democratic element in this writer—his tone being one of reproach

against those who had abused their prosperity, and were now suffering in consequence, but, as he represents, without being amended by their sufferings (vi. 12-8; Niebuhr, Vortr. iii. 325). He contrasts the austere virtues of republican Rome with the luxury in which the Christians of his own time indulged (i. 2); and, while he draws a dismal picture of all classes, he is especially severe on the rich and noble (e.g. iv. 4-7). M. Ampère has an interesting chapter on Salvian, ii. 178-191.

^t By Baronius, 476. 3.

^u Salv. viii. 2; Schröckh, xvi. 213-6; Beugnot, ii. 231.

^v Gibbon, iii. 316-7; Beugnot, ii. 211-2, 238, 248-9.

^w Proc. de B. Vand. i. 5; Beugnot, ii. 247.

^y Patrol. lix. 110-6; Beugnot, ii. 274.

Theodoric the Goth, the conqueror of Odoacer,^z enacted the punishment of death against all who should practise any pagan rites.^a There is no evidence that this law was ever executed, nor perhaps was any pagan so firmly convinced of the truth of his religion as to brave death for the assertion of it; but from that time paganism ceases to appear in the light of history. Remnants of it, however, continued to lurk in most of the western countries; although both particular actions and popular customs which have been characterized as pagan are generally to be referred to a mixture of superstition with Christianity rather than to any intentional preference of heathenism;^b and although much confusion has been introduced by writers who speak of the deities of barbarous nations under the names of the Greek and Roman mythology.

III. (1.) As the empire of old Rome disappears from view, we begin to discern, not only the great spiritual power which will hereafter so largely engage our attention, but the origin of modern European states; and the appearance of the northern nations in civil history brings them into connexion with the history of the Church. The hosts which in succession poured down on the provinces of the Empire soon embraced Christianity;^c but their creed was generally not that of the orthodox community. The missionaries who wrought on the Teutonic nations appear to have gone forth from among the Visigoths, whose lapse into Arianism has already been related;^d and in some cases, where the conversion was originally to the Catholic faith, Arianism was afterwards adopted in its stead,—as less perplexing to rude minds, as recommended by matrimonial or political alliances, and perhaps also because of its difference from the system professed by the rulers of Rome and Constantinople.^e Thus the Burgundians, on the Rhine,

^z See below, p. 517.

^a Beugnot, ii. 282; Gieseler, I. ii. 345 (referring to Lindenbrog, Cod. Legum Ant. p. 255).

^b When Belisarius was holding Rome against the Goths, in 537, it is said that “a fruitless effort to turn the gates of the Temple of Janus on their rusty hinges revealed the scandalous secret that some Romans were still attached to the superstition of their ancestors” (Gibbon, iv. 47; Proc. de Bello Gothico, i. 25, p. 375). Yet perhaps we need not infer more from this as to the belief of the persons than we infer from the

existence of pagan ideas and practices in Scotland or in Scandinavia at the present day. The Trullan Council, in 691 (?), forbids certain pagan practices (cc. 62, 65, 94); but it would seem that the religious significance of these had been forgotten by those who used them.

^c Niebuhr remarks that the proportion of Christians among the Goths was much greater than among the populations which they invaded. Vorträge, iii. 316.

^d P. 293. Revillout, 61.

^e Schröckh, xviii. 72; Neand, iv. 91; Gieseler, I. ii. 340; Rückert, i. 221.

who in consequence of having settled in a territory where Christianity had before prevailed, had become Christians about the year 413, exchanged Catholicism for Arianism half a century later;^f and the Suevi, in Spain, originally converted by the orthodox bishops of Lusitania, became Arians in 469.^g Genseric has been charged with having effected a similar change among the Vandals; but it would seem that the accusation was invented for the purpose of making his name more odious, and that the Christianity of his nation was Arian from the first.^h The conversion of barbarian tribes, unlike that of the Romans, usually began with the prince; and after his example the multitude pressed to the font. Among those who had been converted by such a process, it will be readily conceived that there was very little understanding of their new profession; that their Christianity was of a rude kind, and long retained a mixture of ideas derived from their old superstitions.ⁱ Yet, with all its defects, both in doctrine and in morality, and although it held but a very imperfect control over the conduct of those who professed it, it did much to soften their ferocity, and greatly mitigated the sufferings of the more civilized races which they subdued.^k

(2.) The religious story of Britain is entitled to our especial attention. Yet a writer who undertakes a general compendium of Church history is bound, instead of exaggerating the proportion which that of his own country would rightly bear to the whole, to endeavour to preserve uniformity of scale, while he must refer his readers for further information to works which are expressly devoted to this portion of his subject.

During the fourth century, we find mention of British bishops as having attended the Councils of Arles,^l Sardica,^m and Rimini; at the last of these it is said that three of them were compelled by poverty to accept an allowance from the emperor, which their brethren and the bishops of Gaul declined.ⁿ It is also argued (but perhaps with more of patriotism than of plausibility), that there were British bishops at the Council of Nicæa.^o Although it would appear that Arianism was not unknown in our island,^p the

^f Soc. vii. 30; Baron. 413. 27, with Pagi's notes; Rettberg, i. 254-5.

^g Isid. Hispal. de Regibus Goth. 90 (Patrol. lxxxiii. 1082); Revillout, 63-6.

^h Schröckh, vii. 345; xviii. 89. Idatius says that "ut aliquorum relatio habet," he was an apostate (Chron. A.D. 428; Patrol. lxxiv.). Gibbon speaks of him as an apostate in early life. iii. 365.

ⁱ Schröckh, vii. 333; Gieseler, I. ii. 341.

^k Schröckh, viii. 337.

^l See p. 155.

^m Athan. Apol. adv. Arianos, 1.

ⁿ Sulp. Sev. Hist. Sac. ii. 41 (Patrol. xx.).

^o See Stillingfleet, Origines Britannicæ, b. iii. 56-7; Collier, i. 65-6.

^p Gildas, i. 9 (Patrol. lxix.); Beda, i. 8.

orthodoxy of the British bishops throughout the Arian controversy is attested by the weighty evidence of Athanasius and Hilary.^q

Pelagius did not attempt to propagate his opinions in his native country; but, when proscribed elsewhere, they were introduced into Britain by one Agricola, and found so much acceptance that the clergy resolved to call in foreign aid^r—A.D. 429. much in the same manner as their countrymen had been accustomed to invoke the help of the Roman legions for protection against the attacks of their northern neighbours. In consequence of an application from Britain, German, bishop of Auxerre, and Lupus,^s bishop of Troyes, were deputed by a synod of Gaulish bishops to combat the growing heresy.^t Their preaching^u and their sanctity produced a great effect, which was seconded by an abundance of miracles. In a conference at St. Albans they defeated the heretical teachers; and it is said that German obtained for the Britons a victory over the Picts and Saxons by directing an army, mostly composed of newly-baptized converts, to raise a loud shout of *Allelujah!*^x About eighteen years later, German was again invited to visit Britain, for the purpose of eradicating the remains of Pelagianism, which had begun to revive; and his labours were again successful.^y

The Romans, finding themselves unable to spare the forces necessary for a military establishment in Britain, had abandoned the island in the year 409.^z After their withdrawal, the govern-

^q Ath. ad Jovianum, 2 (t. i. p. 781); Hil. de Synodis, init.

^r Beda, i. 17; Collier, i. 124.

^s Lupus was brother to a monk of Lerins named Vincent, who has been identified with the author of the 'Com-monitorium adversus Hæreticos' (see below, c. xiii.). But Tillemont thinks that it was another, xvi. 128.

^t Prosper, according to the common copies of his chronicle (see Patrol. li. 595), says that these bishops were sent by Celestine, bishop of Rome, at the request of Palladius, a deacon. But the passage is doubtful; and, although it is very possible that Celestine may have wished to root out Pelagianism from Britain (as Prosper elsewhere states that he did, but without mention of German and Lupus—*Contra Collator*. xxi. 2), there is much more probability in the statement made by German's biographer, Constantius (of whose book there is a metrical version by Heric of Auxerre, Patrol. cxxiv. 1166), by Bede (i. 17) and others—that the application from

Britain was made to the bishops of Gaul, and was answered by them. See Baron. 435. 16; Tillem. xiv. 154; xv. 15; Collier, i. 104; Lingard, A. S. Ch. i. 8; Lappenberg, i. 62; Kemble, ii. 356.

^u That the Gaulish bishops were masters of Celtic, see Lingard, A. S. Ch. i. 9.

^x Beda, i. 18; Gildas, i. 18; Collier, i. 102. This is usually placed in Wales, which tradition represents as the chief scene of German's exploits, and as indebted to him for monasteries, schools, &c. But Dr. Lingard remarks that all such representations take their colour from a later time, when the Britons had been driven into the mountains by the Saxons. (A. S. Ch. i. 10-1.) It has been said that German and Lupus introduced the Gaulish liturgy into Britain; but this Mr. Palmer considers a mistake. Orig. Liturg. i. 176-7, ed. 2.

^y Beda, i. 21.

^z Gibbon, iii. 163; Turner's Anglo-Saxons, i. 180.

ment became gradually vested in the hands of a multitude of petty princes, and the moral condition of the inhabitants was such that the calamities which followed are represented as a righteous judgment on it.^a In 449, the Jutes Hengist and Horsa are said to have landed in the Isle of Thanet.^b The Jutes, Angles, and Saxons poured in on the country, and by degrees got possession of all except the mountainous districts of the west. "Public and private buildings were alike destroyed," says Bede;^c "priests were everywhere murdered at the altar; bishops and their people were indiscriminately slaughtered with fire and sword, and there was no one to bury the victims of such cruelty. Some of the wretched remnant were seized on the mountains, and were butchered by heaps; others, worn out with hunger, surrendered themselves, and, on condition that they should not be immediately put to death, embraced perpetual slavery for the sake of sustenance; some sorrowfully made for regions beyond the sea; others remained in their country, and, in continual trembling and anxiety, led a life of poverty among mountains, forests, and lofty rocks."^d Some of the Britons found a refuge in Armorica;^e such of them as became serfs to the conquerors gradually lapsed into heathenism; while those who maintained their independence in Cornwall, Wales, or Cumberland, although they preserved their Christianity, lost their Roman civilisation and the use of the Latin tongue. Britain was withdrawn from the view of the Roman world, and was for a time regarded as a land of mystery and fable.^f

^a See Gildas, *passim*; Bed. i. 12, 14; Lingard's Hist. Engl. i. 66-7; Palgrave's Anglo-Saxons, 30.

^b Bede, i. 15. Hengist and Horsa are supposed to be mythical by Mr. Kemble (i. 19, 32) and Dr. Donaldson (Cambridge Essays, 1856, p. 47), whose theories, however, agree better in destruction than in reconstruction. See Lappen-berg, i. 65, seqq.; Thorpe, in transl. of Lappenb. i. 275; Lingard, H. E. i. 74-6; Martineau, 11-2.

^c i. 15.

^d The passage is mainly borrowed from Gildas, i. 25, and is suspected of exaggeration or fable. Turner, i. 181; Kemble, i. 21.

^e Inett, i. 11; Turner, ii. 213. See Hallam, Middle Ages, i. 2, and Suppl. Notes, No. 1.

^f Procop. de Bello, Goth. iv. 21; Gibbon, iii. 433-5. It is said that, although the Roman remains in Britain exhibit "records of almost every religion of the

heathen world," there is not among them "the slightest trace of Christianity."

"How contrary," exclaims a late essayist, "is this to the bold averments of the old ecclesiastical writers, who would lead us to imagine that the Romans left Britain covered with churches and divided into bishops' sees [dioceses?]; and how conformable to the statement that Augustine did not find a single Christian either among the Romans or the Saxons in the south of England!" (Edinb. Review, xciv. 191, July, 1851.) Of the remarks which naturally suggest themselves on this strangely precipitate conclusion, I shall mention only one—that the traces of heathen religion found in Britain are all connected with things which were not practised by the Christians of the times in question—the worship of images, the sacrifice of animals, the custom of burning the bodies of the dead, and of preserving their ashes in urns.

(3.) Amid the fictions with which the early history of Scotland is overlaid, it appears to be pretty certain that Ninian preached among the southern Picts in the beginning of the fifth century. This missionary, who is said by some authorities to have been a relation of St. Martin of Tours, and to have received his education at Rome, while others make him the son of a British chief,^g fixed his see in Galloway, where he erected a church in honour of St. Martin. The building, being of white stone (whereas the British churches were usually of less durable materials), was distinguished by the name of *Candida Casa*,^h which became that of the see. Ninian's labours may probably be dated between the years 412 and 432.ⁱ

(4.) It is to the earlier half of the fifth century that the conversion of Ireland is usually referred. Although there had probably been some Christians in the island before that time,^k the accounts of bishops who are said to have previously flourished there are generally rejected as fabulous.^l Patrick, the apostle of Ireland,^m speaks of himself as having been born at a place called Bonaven,ⁿ which by some writers is identified with Boulogne, while others suppose it to be a village which from him is called Kirkpatrick, near Dumbarton.^o His original name is said to have been Suc-

^g See the account of him in the "Lives of English Saints," 1844, pp. 14, 20.

^h In Saxon *Hwitaern*, now Whithorn (Russell in Spottiswoode, i. 256). The late biographer, however, shows reason for supposing that the name was older, being derived, not from Ninian's church, but from some other building.—90.

ⁱ Beda, iii. 4; Spottiswoode, i. 12.

^k This seems to be implied in St. Patrick's "Confession" (22), where he speaks of himself as having gone "usque ad exteras partes, ubi nemo ultra erat, et ubi nunquam aliquis pervenerat qui baptizaret, aut clericos ordinaret, aut populum consummaret,"—"from which," says Mr. King (i. 3), "it is evident that some of the less remote parts had been visited by Christian missionaries already." Compare Prosper, quoted below, p. 494, in *v*. Among the arguments for the Greek origin of the Irish church is one of an architectural kind—that the earliest Irish buildings resemble the Cyclopean masonry (Fergusson's Handbook of Architecture, 916, 924). But surely it is more likely that two barbarous nations, although distant in time and in place, should have built in the same rude fashion, than that Greek ecclesiastics of the imperial days should have

reverted to the Cyclopean style as a model. Mr. Petrie, in his learned essay on the Ecclesiastical Architecture of Ireland (Dubl. 1845), does not refer any of these buildings to an age earlier than that of St. Patrick.

^l Tillem. xvi. 454; Schröckh, xvi. 219; Lanigan, i. 22, 36-7; Villanueva, n. in S. Patr. 230.

^m On the subject of St. Patrick, there are disputes which render it hazardous to express an opinion on any point connected with his history. By some his very existence is denied. (See Lanigan, i. 48-79; King, i. 13-6; British Magazine, vols. viii.-ix. xxiv. 597, seqq.; xxv. 130. seqq.) His birth is placed by Ussher as early as 372, and he is said to have lived to 120. Tillemont places his birth between 395 and 415 (xvi. 455); Lanigan in 387 (i. 137). See Schröckh, xv. 223.

ⁿ Confessio, 1, in his works edited by Villanueva, Dubl. 1835; or Patrol. liii.

^o He speaks (Conf. 10) of being in *Britanniis* with his parents. Dr. Lanigan strenuously contends for the Gaulish birth (i. 88, seqq.), and Mr. King thinks it most likely (i. 17). On the other side see Wordsworth on the Irish Church, 31-2.

cath.^p His father, who seems to have been a Romanized Briton, was of curial rank, and a deacon of the church; his grandfather was a presbyter.^q At the age of sixteen the youth was carried off as a captive to Ireland, where he was employed in tending sheep or cattle amid the loneliness of forests and mountains. In this occupation he was exposed to great miseries, but his soul was visited by thoughts to which it had before been a stranger; he prayed often, and his inward fervour rendered him insensible to the frost, the snow, and the rain.^r After six years he was delivered from his captivity by means in which, according to his narrative, Providence takes the aspect of miracle, and returned to his native country.^s Years passed on; Patrick, according to some accounts, had travelled widely, and had studied under Martin of Tours and German of Auxerre;^t and he had been ordained a presbyter, when he felt himself called by visions to preach the Gospel in the land where he had been a captive.^u His friends opposed his design of casting himself among its savage people;^x one of them, who was most familiar with him, endeavoured to prevent his consecration by divulging some act which Patrick had confided to him as having been committed under the age of fifteen—thirty years before; but he resolutely broke through all hindrances, and was consecrated bishop of the Irish. Palladius, a Briton by birth, and deacon of

the Roman Church, had been sent a short time before
A.D. 431. by Coelestine to labour among that nation,^y although rather with a view to the suppression of Pelagianism than to the conversion of the heathen as the primary object of his mission;^z but after a short stay he had withdrawn, and apparently had died.^a Patrick was more persevering and more successful.^b He devoted the remainder of his life to the Irish—denying himself the satis-

^p Lanigan thinks that this name means "wearer of the *succa*," an episcopal garment; and therefore that, if Patrick ever bore it, it was given to him by the Irish.—i. 141.

^q Conf. i.; Ad Subditos Corotici, 5.

^r Conf. i. 2, 6.

^s Ib. 6-9; 11-3.

^t See Lanigan, c. iv.; King, i. 28. Martin, however, died not later than 400. See p. 287.

^u Conf. 10.

^v Ib. 20.

^y "Ad Scotos in Christum credentes." (Prosp. Chron. A.D. 435; Bede, i. 13.) It is generally supposed that the "Scots" here meant were the Irish (see Lanigan, i. 9-11, 46). Perhaps, however, I ought to feel myself bound to take part with Skinner (i. 48-64), Bp. Russell (i. 7),

and others of my countrymen, in maintaining that Palladius was sent to some of the same race who had already settled in Scotland.

^z Prosp. c. Collat. xxi. 2; Hussey, n. in Bed. i. 13.

^a Tillem. xvi. 454; Collier, i. 117; Schröckh, xvi. 220-1; Neander, iii. 174; Wordsworth, 27.

^b Tillem. xvi. 460, seqq. The story of Patrick's having also been sent by Coelestine (Nennius, 56) is a later fiction. His "Confession" (cc. 10, seqq.) favours the idea that he was consecrated in Britain. Mr. King, however, thinks it most likely that the consecration took place in France (i. 28-31). See Tillemont, xvi. 458-9; Neander, Ch. Hist. iii. 174; Gieseler, I. ii. 340; Wordsworth, 34.

faction of revisiting his country and his kindred,^c and labouring with great effect, although often exposed to perils from the hostility of the Druids, and of the heathen princes, who slew many of his converts.^d The date usually assigned for the commencement of his mission is the same with that of Ninian's death—A.D. 432; the time of his own death has been a subject of dispute, but is most probably referred to the year 493.^e

(5.) In Southern Germany, where the Church had been regularly organized in the time of the Roman dominion, the preservation of the faith through the changes and troubles of the age, and the conversion of the new masters of the country, were mainly due to the exertions of Severin, the "Apostle of Noricum."^f The origin of this missionary is unknown; he himself, as if from a feeling of humility, took pains to conceal it; but, although he came immediately from the East, the purity of his Latin was supposed to prove that he was a man of Italian birth, who, for the sake of spiritual perfection, had betaken himself to some oriental solitude.^g He appeared in the region of Bavaria and Austria, shortly after the death of Attila (A. D. 454), and declared that he felt himself called by visions to forego his taste for a contemplative life, in order that he might labour among the people of those countries, which were then desolated by the barbarian invasions.^h The sight of his voluntary austerities encouraged the wretched inhabitants to endure the privations and other evils which for them were unavoidable;ⁱ he gained a vast influence over all classes, and obtained from the richer the means of relieving those whose distress was greatest.^k Severin declined consecration as a bishop, on the ground that he was sufficiently employed in the ministration to which he had dedicated himself; and in this he was aided by monks, of whom he founded communities at Vienna, Juvavium (Salzburg), Passau, and elsewhere.^l His venerable character and life awed the rude invaders, who at his suit often showed mercy to the helpless population;^m his presence was supposed to be a pro-

^c Conf. 19.

^d Ib. 22-3. See his epistle "Ad Christianos Corotici tyranni subditos."

^e King, i. 35. Tillemont places the mission not earlier than 440 nor later than 460 (xvi. 783-4). Lanigan (i. 207) dates St. Patrick's death in 465; Dr. Wordsworth (34) and others in 492. There was in the same age another eminent missionary to Ireland, Sen-Patrick (*i. e.* Patrick the elder), who has often been confounded with St. Patrick, but

is supposed by Mr. Petrie to have been the same with Palladius. His death is placed in 458 or 461. King, i. 55.

^f Rettberg, i. 228-9. The authority for Severin is a Life by Eugippius, an African abbot. (Patrol. lxii.)

^g Vita, 4.

^h Ib. 7, 11, 17.

ⁱ Ib. 11.

^k Ib. 9, 25, 26.

^l Ib. 4, 17; Rettberg, i. 244.

^m Ib. 27, 39.

tection to the place of his abode, so that the inhabitants of the Roman towns on the Danube entreated him to reside among them by turns.ⁿ His prayers were believed to prevail with heaven; the gifts of prophecy and miracles were ascribed to him. Among the instances of his prophetic foresight, it is related that, when visited by Odoacer, who had lately enlisted in the imperial guard, he discerned in the meanly dressed recruit the future king of Italy;^o and that he foretold the day of his own death, which took place in 482.^p

(6.) The most important conversion of the fifth century was that of Chlodowig or Clovis, who, from being king of the Salian Franks, with a narrow territory in the neighbourhood of Tournay and Cambray,^q became the founder of the great French monarchy. Clovis, who succeeded to his hereditary kingdom in 482, married in 493 Clotilda or Chrotochild, the daughter of Chilperic, a Burgundian prince who had adhered to the Catholic faith while the rest of his family fell into Arianism, and who, having been deprived of his inheritance and of life by his Arian brother Gundobald, was popularly regarded by the Catholics of Gaul as a martyr for the orthodox faith.^r Clotilda long and zealously urged her husband to embrace Christianity; but although, among other evidences, she represented to him the miracles for which the shrine of St. Martin, at Tours, was then famous,^s Clovis remained obstinate—measuring the power of a deity by the prosperity of his worshippers, and supposing that the downfall of the Roman empire was a sufficient disproof of the religion which it had professed.^t She prevailed with him, however, to let their firstborn son be baptized, and, in the hope of producing an impression on the king, the rite was administered with extraordinary pomp; but the death of the child, which took place within a few days, furnished Clovis with a new argument against a change of religion. A second son was also baptized, and, as he too fell sick, the king expected the vengeance of the gods to show itself in a repetition of the elder brother's fate; but at the earnest prayer of Clotilda, the prince recovered.^u The queen continued her attempts to convert her husband, but without success, until at length, A.D. 496. when engaged with the Alemanni in the battle of

ⁿ Vita, 19.

^o Ib. 14.

^p Greg. Turon. ii. 28; Revillout, 66-7;

^q Ib. 51. See on Severin, Neander,

Rückert, i. 315; Perry, 75.

Ch. Hist. v. 34-6; Memorials, 333-341;

^r Nicet. Trevir. Ep. i. 4-5 (Patrol.

Ozanam, Civ. Chrét. au 5^me Siècle, i. 39-42.

lxviii.); Neand. v. 8-9.

^s Hallam, Middle Ages, Suppl. Notes,

^t Greg. Tur. ii. 29; Gibbon, iii. 386.

4; Perry, c. 2; Rettberg, i. 263.

^u Greg. Tur. ii. 29.

Tolbiac,^x Clovis, finding himself in danger, invoked the aid of Christ,^y declaring that his old gods had failed him, and vowing to become a Christian if he should obtain the victory.^z The Alemanni were defeated; and at Christmas, 496, Clovis, with three thousand of his warriors, was baptized at Rheims by the bishop, Remigius. The cathedral was sumptuously adorned, brilliant with tapers, and filled with perfumes, of such sweetness that (as we are told) those who were present supposed themselves to be breathing the odours of paradise.^a As the king entered, amid the solemn chant of hymns, he was struck with awe, and, turning to Remigius, who held him by the hand, he asked whether this were the kingdom of heaven that had been promised to him? "No," replied the bishop; "but it is the beginning of the way thither."^b The words of Remigius at the administration of the sacrament are famous—"Sicambrian, gently bow thy neck; worship that which thou hast burnt, and burn that which thou hast worshipped."^c And no less celebrated is the exclamation of Clovis when the bishop one day read to him the story of the Redeemer's passion—"Had I been there with my Franks, I would have avenged his wrongs!"^d

There is no reason for doubting that the conversion of Clovis was sincere, although it was certainly of no enlightened kind, and although, like that of Constantine, (with whom the father of French history compares him),^e it failed to produce in him a consistent Christian life. Nor is its sincerity to be impeached because it proved favourable to the advance of his power;^f although in this respect the profession of Catholic Christianity, as distinguished from Arianism, involved advantages which he was not slow to discern and to profit by. It secured for him the weighty influence of the clergy, who were bound to him by the tie of mutual interest;

^x Zülrich, near Cologne.

^y "Jesu Christe, quem Chrotechildis prædicat esse filium Dei vivi." Greg. Tur. ii. 30.

^z Pagi, viii. 628; Gibbon, iii. 385. See Hallam, Middle Ages, i. 2.

^a Greg. Tur. ii. 31.

^b Hincmar, Vita Remig. 38 (Patrol. cxxv.).

^c Greg. Turon. ii. 31.

^d Fredegar, Epitom. 21 (Patrol, lxxi.). The story of the phial of chrism said to have been brought by a dove from heaven for the baptism of Clovis, does not appear until the time of Hincmar, three centuries and a half later (Vita Remig. 40); even Rohrbacher, for once,

and (viii. 487) is ashamed now to maintain it. The phial was broken during the first French Revolution, but a part of its contents is said to have been preserved, and used at the coronation of Charles X. See Mosh. i. 421-2 and notes; Schröckh, xvi. 239-245; Gieseler, I. ii. 440; Martin, ii. 31; Migne in Patrol. lxxi. 225.

^e Greg. Tur. ii. 31; Gibbon, iii. 386; Schröckh, xvi. 237-8; Rettberg, i. 274-5; Rückert, i. 328-331; ii. 3; Perry, 77, seqq. Planck (ii. 25-31) thinks that it arose merely from motives of policy. Against him see Löbell, 260-3. The immediate result was a loss of part of the Franks, who left Clovis to place themselves under another chief. Hincm. Vita Rem. 39; Löbell, 221, 266.

"projicit ampullas, et sesquipedalia verba,"

those of the south of Gaul, who had been persecuted by the Arian Euric, king of the Visigoths of Toulouse, with a bitterness in which the barbaric hatred of them as Romans was combined with religious intolerance, were ready to welcome an orthodox invader.^g When he was determined to make war on Euric's successor, Alaric, in the year 507, he gave the attack a character of religion, by declaring himself indignant that Arians should possess a part of the Gaulish soil;^h and the story of the war thus undertaken for the faith is embellished by the chroniclers with an abundance of miracles in his favour.ⁱ While unscrupulous in the use of treachery and in profusion of blood for the removal of all who stood in the way of his ambition, he preserved the favour of the clergy by his liberality towards churches and monasteries.^k His religious policy was chiefly directed by Remigius, who having been consecrated to the see of Rheims in 461, at the age of twenty-two, retained it for seventy-two years;^l and by his advice

Clovis, in the last year of his own life, summoned the first Frankish council to meet at Orleans.^m

At the time of his conversion Clovis was the only sovereign who professed the orthodox creed; for the emperor Anastasius favoured the Monophysites, while the princes of the West were Arians. Hence the kings of France derived the title of "Eldest Son of the Church."ⁿ

IV. From the first invasion of Africa, the Arian Vandals cruelly oppressed the Catholics.^o When a deputation of bishops and clergy waited on Genseric for the purpose of representing the sufferings of their party, and of entreating that, although deprived of their churches, they might be allowed to live under the Vandal

^g Tillem. Emp. 445-6; Sismondi, i. 187; Revillout, 149, 154, 162; Rückert, i. 253. See Greg. Tur. ii. 36. "Vestra fides," writes Avitus, bishop of Vienne, to Clovis, "nostra victoria est . . . Tangit enim nos felicitas; quotiescunque illic pugnatis, vincimus." Ep. 41 (Patrol. iv.).

^h Greg. Tur. ii. 37.

ⁱ Ib. See Perry, 85-8.

^k Schröckh, xvi. 249, 250; Sismondi, i. 229-232; Perry, 95. Löbell's vindication of the tone in which Gregory of Tours (ii. 40) speaks of Clovis (253, 265) is ingenious, but not convincing. See Gieseler, I. ii. 453.

^l Hist. Litt. iii. 156. There is a curious passage in the bishop's will. Clovis, while yet unbaptised, had given him

some estates, which, lest the king, in his unbelieving state, should think him greedy, Remigius bestowed for charitable purposes; and thus, he says, he excited the admiration of Clovis, and gained an influence over him. Test. Remig. ap. Flodoard. Hist. Rem. i. 18 (Patrol. cxxxv. 61).

^m Schröckh, xvi. 247-8, 252; Sismondi, i. 235.

ⁿ Gibbon, iii. 388; Sismondi, i. 188.

^o The Vandal persecution is related by Victor, bishop of Vite, himself a Catholic confessor, whose work is edited by Ruinart, with additions ('Historia Persecutionis Vandalicæ,' Paris, 1699), and is reprinted in vol. lviii. of Migne's Patrologia.

rule and to minister to the consolation of their brethren, he burst into a fury, told them that he did not wish to leave one of their name or race alive, and was with difficulty dissuaded from throwing them into the sea.^p Many bishops and others were banished among the savage tribes of Africa; and here, as had often happened in similar cases, their exile became the occasion of spreading the Gospel to quarters which it had not before reached.

After the death of Deogratias—whose charity towards A.D. 457.
Genseric's Roman captives is rendered the more admirable by the depression which his own church was suffering—no consecration of bishops was allowed in the province of Africa; and it is said that, in consequence of this prohibition, only three out of a hundred and sixty-four sees were found to be occupied thirty years after (A.D. 487). But Genseric, whose time and thoughts were chiefly employed on plundering expeditions abroad, was a less terrible scourge to the Catholics than his son, Hunneric, who succeeded him in 477.^q In the beginning of his reign, Hunneric affected lenity towards them, and directed his severity against the Manichæans. These sectaries were in the habit of disguising themselves under the profession of less obnoxious forms of religion; and the king had the mortification of finding that most of those whom he detected had professed to be members, and some of them even clergy, of his own sect—having naturally preferred the safest communion as that to which they should ostensibly attach themselves.^r Hunneric was connected with the imperial family, by having married the captive Eudocia, daughter of Valentinian III. and Eudoxia.^s At the intercession of her sister Placidia, and of the eastern emperor Zeno, he intimated to the Catholics of Carthage, in 481, that they were at liberty to choose a bishop: but he added the condition that the same privileges which he allowed them should be granted in the East to the Arians, with liberty to perform their services and to preach in whatever language they pleased;^t and he threatened that, if these terms were not observed, the new bishop and his brethren should be sent into banishment among the

^p Victor, i. 5.

^q Gibbon, iii. 363, seqq.

^r Victor, ii. 1.

^s Procop. de Bello Vandal. i. 5.

^t Victor, ii. 2; Ruinart, p. 496. This, according to Neander (Memorials, 323), "intimates that already in the East certain languages began to be considered as sacred, and that there was a wish not to employ the Teutonic language, as too rude for the service of the Church.

Chrysostom," he adds, "took a different view; for he gave a Gothic presbyter permission to preach at Constantinople in the Gothic language" (see p. 380), &c. Is not the meaning rather that Hunneric claimed for his fellow-sectaries in the East, the use not only of the barbarian tongues (which the emperor would have less scrupled to grant), but of the Greek—with liberty of Arianizing for Greeks as well as for barbarians?

Moors. The elder Catholics dreaded such conditions, and declared themselves resolved rather to live still under the immediate government of Him who had hitherto protected them. But the eagerness of the younger brethren, who had never seen a bishop of Carthage, prevailed, and Eugenius was consecrated to the see.^a

The virtues of the new prelate made a general impression, which alarmed the Arian clergy; and at their suggestion, Hunneric issued an order that no person in a Vandal dress should be allowed to enter the churches of the Catholics. Eugenius declared that he could not comply with this order—that God's house was open to all; whereupon officers of the government were stationed at the doors of churches, with instructions to scalp all Vandals of either sex who should attempt to enter.^x For a time, the king's attention was diverted from the persecution by anxiety to secure the succession to the throne for his son. With a view to this, he executed some of his nearest relations, burnt the patriarch of his own sect for the crime of being intimate with the objects of his jealousy, and put many others of the Arian clergy to the same horrible death.^y The Catholics in the meanwhile apprehended that his fury might probably be next turned on themselves; and visions and other omens are related as having foreshown the approaching trials.^z

An edict was issued that no one who did not profess Arianism should be employed about the court, or in the public service. The recusants were deprived of all their property, and were banished to Sicily and Sardinia; the possessions of bishops were confiscated; the virgins of the Church were seized, and were savagely tortured in the hope of forcing from them an avowal of licentious intercourse with the bishops and clergy.^a Four thousand nine hundred and seventy-six Catholics—bishops, clergy, and laity—were condemned to banishment into Mauritania. Hunneric was entreated to spare one aged bishop, who was paralytic in body and imbecile in mind; but he replied that, if the old man could not ride to the place of exile, he should be dragged by wild oxen. The victims, after attempts had in vain been made to cajole them by a show of kindness, were treated with atrocious and loathsome barbarity. Many died on the way in consequence of the cruelty of their Moorish guards; and the survivors found their place of exile pestilential, and infested by venomous serpents.^b

^a Victor, ii. 2.

^x "Palis dentatis jactis in capite, crinibusque in eisdem colligatis, ac vehementius stringentes, simul cum capillis

omnem pelliculam capitis auferebant."

Ib. 3. ^y Ib. 5. ^z Ib. 6. ^a Ib. 7.

^b Ib. 8-12; Tillem. xvi. 549-553; Gibbon, iii. 369.

The king now summoned both parties to a disputation at Carthage. Eugenius professed his willingness to argue, but said that, as the question concerned the whole Church, he was not at liberty to engage in a conference without the consent of his brethren in other countries. The objection was advanced in the hope that the Catholics might thus have an opportunity of making their sufferings generally known, and that they might obtain the aid of disputants who were not amenable to Hunneric's tyranny; he answered it by saying, "Make me master of all the world, and I will grant what you require."^c The first of February, 484, was fixed on for the opening of the conference. At the Epiphany, it is said, a blind man was thrice charged by visions to go to Eugenius, when the bishop should be engaged in the benediction of the font, and to beg for the recovery of his sight. Eugenius after some hesitation performed the cure, by applying the baptismal water in the form of the cross; and the miracle, performed in the presence of a large congregation, was hailed by the orthodox with enthusiasm. The Arians, however, ascribed it to magic,^d and Hunneric, in order at once to terrify the Catholics and to weaken them for the intended disputation, burnt Lætus, one of the most learned members of their party, who had been long confined in prison.^e On the appointed day, the Catholics, at their entrance into the place of conference, discovered the Arian patriarch, Cyrila, seated on a lofty throne; an arrangement of which they reasonably complained, as inconsistent with the equality and impartiality which ought to be observed at such meetings. Cyrila, finding them better prepared than he had expected, declined a disputation, on the plea that he could not speak Latin;^f Eugenius handed in a long profession of faith;^g and the meeting ended without any discussion.

Feb. 1, 484.

Hunneric followed up the conference by ordering that all the churches of the Catholics should be shut in one day, and that their funds should be transferred to the Arians. He also issued an edict

^c Victor, ii. 13-5.

^d Ib. 17. Gregory of Tours relates that the Arians—in what stage of the contest is not certain—by way of opposing the miracles of the Catholics, engaged a man to counterfeit blindness, with the intention of pretending to cure him. When their bishop laid his hand on him, the pretender was struck with real blindness, accompanied by an excruciating pain in his eyes. He confessed the imposture, and avowed him-

self a convert to the orthodox faith; whereupon he was cured by Eugenius and two other Catholic bishops. Hist. ii. 2.

^e Victor, ii. 17.

^f The Catholics said that this inability was pretended (ib. 18); but, as Gibbon remarks (iii. 370), Cyrila might have been able to converse tolerably in the language, without being master of it sufficiently to dispute in it.

^g This fills Victor's third book.

in which he charged the Catholics with disorderly behaviour at the late meeting, and, after a recital of the penalties to which the Arians had been subjected by the imperial laws, he enacted that the Catholics within his dominions should be liable to the like. It was forbidden that any one should give them food or lodging, under pain of being burnt, with his house and family.^h The bishops were then required to swear to the succession of the king's son Hilderic. Forty-six who refused, on the plea that Christians ought not to swear—a plea which, as the historian of the persecution acknowledges, was intended only to serve as an excuse—were sent to cut wood in Corsica; while those who complied, three hundred and two in number, were banished, and obliged to work in agriculture, as having broken the Scriptural prohibition against oaths. Eighty-eight bishops were terrified or flattered into an abandonment of the Catholic faith.ⁱ

The barbarities which followed need not be here detailed.^k Victor of Vite states that the Arian clergy were more cruel than even the officers of the government; he tells us that they used to break into houses, sword in hand, and to force their baptism on the inmates of all ages,—often during the night, and while the recipients of this strange sacrament were asleep.^l The most celebrated incident in the story of the persecution is the case of the confessors of Typasa. The Catholics of that town stedfastly refused to acknowledge an Arian bishop, and persisted in celebrating their rites; whereupon, by Hunneric's command, a number of them—sixty, according to some accounts—had their right hands amputated and their tongues cut out by the roots. Yet it is related that, by a miracle, they continued to speak as before; and Victor mentions, as a particularly well known member of their company, a subdeacon named Reparatus, who found a home in the palace of Constantinople.^m

^h Victor, iv. 1-3.

ⁱ Ib. 4-5; Tillem. xvi. 567; Gibbon, iii. 371.

^k See Victor, lib. v.

^l Ib. v. 13.

^m Ib. 6. See Evagr. iv. 14; Tillem. xvi. 578-580; Ruinart, 482, seqq.; Mosh. i. 478, and notes; Schröckh, xviii. 102-3; Gibbon, iii. 373; Newman on Miracles, 200-213. The fact of these persons speaking after the loss of their tongues seems sufficiently attested, —in particular by Æneas of Gaza, a Platonic philosopher and convert to Christianity, who professes to have closely examined them (Patrol. lviii. 138); and the Emperor Justi-

nian, in an edict, states that he himself had witnessed it. (Cod. I. xxvii.) Other writers add circumstances which do not increase the probability of the story—as that among the confessors was a youth who had never been able to speak until he was deprived of his tongue (Marcellinus, Chron. A.D. 484, Patrol. li.); and that one (or, according to another account, two) of the number, through afterwards falling into carnal sin, forfeited the miraculous gift. (Procop. de Bello Vand. i. 8, p. 196; see Ruinart, 482, seqq.) Dr. Newman has overstated the *motive* for the miracle, by assuming too decidedly that the mutilation of

While the persecution was at its height, Africa was laid waste by famine and pestilence, and Hunneric, after a reign of seven years and ten months, died by the same loathsome disease as Herod and other persecutors.^a

Amid the inconsistent accounts which are given of Hunneric's nephew and successor, Gundamund, it would appear ^{A.D. 484-} that at first he followed the policy of the preceding ^{496.} reign, but that afterwards he allowed the Catholics to enjoy toleration.^o His brother, Thrasimund, who reigned from 496 to 523,^p was the ablest of the Vandal kings, and, unlike his race in general, was distinguished by a love of literature;^q but he was a bigoted Arian, and, after having in vain attempted to gain the Catholics by bribery, laid snares for them, in order to obtain a pretext for persecution.^r Their sufferings were great during this reign. Thrasimund forbade the consecration of bishops, and sent two hundred and twenty members of the order into banishment for a breach of his prohibition.^s Among his victims was Eugenius of Carthage, who died in exile at Albi.^t On the death of Thrasimund, Hilderic—the same to whom an oath of fidelity had been exacted ^{A.D. 523.} by his father Hunneric—succeeded to the throne, after an exclusion of nearly forty years. His predecessor had compelled him to swear that he would make no change in the state of religion; but Hilderic, a prince of gentle temper, thought it less sinful to break than to keep such an engagement, and granted the Catholics the free exercise of their religion.^u The usurper Gelimer, in 530, revived the persecuting spirit of Arianism, but within four years the Vandal dominion was overthrown ^{A.D. 534.} by the arms of Justinian's general, Belisarius.^x

these persons was intended to silence their determined confession of the orthodox faith—a point which comes out more distinctly in proportion as the narrators are more remote from the time. Thus, Victor says nothing of it; but St. Gregory the Great—who, besides other mistakes, turns the confessors into bishops, and misdates the persecution by forty years or more—lays great stress on it (Dial. iii. 32. See Newman, 207-8). But in truth it seems to be well ascertained that persons who have been deprived of their tongue may, without a miracle, retain the power of speech. See a late instance quoted from Col. Churchill's "Lebanon," iii. 384; in Dean Milman's

"Latin Christianity," i. 478.

^a Victor, v. 21. Another writer says that his bowels gushed out. Vict. Tunun. Patrol. lxxviii. 946.

^o See Ruinart, 547, seqq.; Tillem. xvi. 590-600; Schröckh, xviii. 103.

^p Pagi, ix. 304.

^q Gibbon, iii. 496.

^r Procop. de B. Vand. i. 8, p. 197.

^s Vita Fulgentii, 15, 20, seqq. (Patrol. lxxv.); Baron. 504-37; Gibbon, iii. 368.

^t Greg. Tur. ii. 3.

^u Procop. de B. Vand. i. 9, p. 199; Comp. Vict. Tunun. A.D. 523 (Patrol. lxxviii.).

^x Gibbon, iii. 366.

During the contest with the Vandals the most eminent controversialists on the Catholic side were Vigilus, bishop of Tapsus (to whom some have ascribed the authorship of the Athanasian creed),^y and Fulgentius, bishop of Ruspe.

^y On this creed (which is perhaps of yet later date), see Book III. c. vii. sect. 4. The chief ground for ascribing it to Vigilus is, that, in controversy, he had recourse to the device of imposing works

of his own on the Vandals as the compositions of Athanasius and Augustine. See Chifflet, in *Patrol.* lxii. 471, seqq.; Gibbon, iii. 371.

CHAPTER XII.

MONOPHYSITISM.—JUSTINIAN.—THE “THREE ARTICLES.”

A.D. 451–566.

I. THE Council of Chalcedon was represented as Nestorian by its opponents, and the strife which it was meant to allay continued to distract the Church.^a The name of *Eutychians* was soon superseded by that of *Monophysites*, *i. e.* maintainers of one nature only; for Eutyches himself fell into discredit, and those who rejected the late council were generally willing to anathematise him, on account of a sort of Docetism which was imputed to him—an opinion that the body of our Lord was not truly human, but had descended from heaven.^b The Monophysites, on the contrary, maintained that the Saviour was “consubstantial with us, as touching his flesh;” while as to his soul they rejected the idea of an absorption of the manhood in the Godhead, and reverted to the formula “one incarnate nature,” acknowledging moreover, that this *one* nature was *twofold*.^c In addition to the elder authorities on which they had hitherto relied, the party was reinforced, towards the end of the century, by a forgery executed in Egypt—the mystical works ascribed to Dionysius the Areopagite. These writings, although originally brought forward by a heterodox party, and although their essence is said to be not Christian, but neo-Platonic,^d were, with hardly a question, universally received as genuine, and retained their credit for a thousand years.^e

Juvenal, of Jerusalem, on returning from Chalcedon, found that the see for which he had just achieved the patriarchal dignity was occupied by a turbulent monk named Theodosius, who was coun-

^a Tillem. xv. 731-4; Gieseler, I. ii. 554-7.

^b Vigil. Tapsens. c. Eutych. iii. 1 (Patrol. lxii.); Liberatus, 11 (ib. lxviii. 998); Walch, vi. 504, seqq.; Gieseler, I. ii. 348-9. See as to a similar notion of the Apollinarians, p. 266. Walch says that the charge against Eutyches was unjust, but that he denied our Lord's consubstantiality with mankind. vi.

^c Evagr. iii. 5; Tillem. xvi. 295; Mosh. i. 494, 497, 498; Gieseler, I. ii. 349.

^d Ritter, vi. 534.

^e Gieseler, I. ii. 352, 386; Ritter, vi. 518, seqq.; Dorner, ii. 196-203. Baronius is vehement for their genuineness. 649. 19.

tenanced by Eudocia, widow of the emperor Theodosius II. For two years this intruder held possession of Palestine, being supported by monks and a force of ruffians, who exercised a general system of terror, burning houses and monasteries, expelling bishops and clergy, and committing murders without restraint. At length, however, through the conciliatory policy of Marcian and Pulcheria, his chief supporters were drawn away from him. Juvenal resumed his bishoprick, and after a time Eudocia, partly influenced by the persuasions of Symeon the Stylite,^f and partly by the calamities which had befallen her daughter and grandchildren in the Vandal expedition against Rome, was induced to rejoin the Catholic communion.^g

At Alexandria Proterius was elected in the room of Dioscorus, but found himself fiercely opposed by a powerful faction, which could only be kept down by a military force, at the expense of much bloodshed.^h On the death of Marcian the malcontents thought that their opportunity had at length arrived. Timothy, named *Ælurus* (the Cat),ⁱ who, with Peter *Mongus* (the Hoarse), had separated from the communion of Proterius, and had been excommunicated by him, raised a mob, and was consecrated by two deposed bishops. On Thursday before Easter Proterius was murdered in the baptistery of his cathedral; his body, after having been hung up in mockery, was dragged about the streets, and cut in pieces; some of the multitude tasted his entrails; the remains were then burnt, and the ashes were scattered to the winds. The Catholic clergy were expelled, and the other adherents of Proterius were persecuted.^k

The accession of Marcian's successor, Leo, was rendered remarkable by his receiving the crown from the hands of the patriarch Anatolius,—the first instance of a solemnity which has become usual in Christian states.^l The new emperor, who before his elevation, had been a military officer, began by publishing a confirmation of all that his predecessor had done in the matter of religion.^m The Alexandrian differences were soon brought under

^f Leo of Rome also wrote to her (Ep. 122), and otherwise exerted himself in the case.

^g Evagr. ii. 5; Baron. 452. 27, seqq.; 455. 18–20; Tillem. xv. 731–7, 752–4, 779–8.

^h Evagr. ii. 5; Liberatus, 14–5.

ⁱ See Walch, vi. 681–2.

^k Evagr. ii. 8; Liberatus, 15; Theod. Lector, i. 8; Tillem. xv. 747–8, 782–8.

^l Gibbon, iii. 313–4; Martene de Antiqq. Eccl. Ritibus, ii. 202; Palmer, Origines Liturgicæ, Supplem., p. 54.

^m Labb. iv. 892, 946, 968; Evagr. ii. 9; Tillem. Emp. vi. 367.

his notice by some envoys of each party; whereupon he issued a requisition to the bishops of every province, and to the most eminent monks, desiring them to give their opinions A.D. 457,
October. on the Council of Chalcedon and on the pretensions of *Ælurus*.ⁿ By this expedient Leo probably hoped to obtain a judgment equivalent to that of a general council, without risking the inconveniences connected with such assemblies. The result was an unanimous sentence against *Ælurus* and in favour of the Council; although some bishops of Pamphylia, while they admitted the correctness of the decisions of Chalcedon, and their utility for the defence of the faith, questioned the fitness of imposing them as terms of communion.^o *Ælurus* was banished to Cherson;^p and another Timothy, called *Salophaciolus*, or the *White*, an ecclesiastic of the Catholic party, was chosen in his stead, and for fifteen years governed the Alexandrian Church with A.D. 460. wisdom and moderation.^q

Leo was succeeded in 474 by his grandson of the same name, the son of his daughter Ariadne by Zeno; but the child died within a year, and Zeno remained in possession of the throne.^r The private character of this emperor was stained by gross and shameless debauchery.^s His reign was disquieted by many rebellions, one of which compelled him for nearly two years A.D. 475-7. to give way to a rival, Basiliscus, the brother-in-law of Leo,—the same whose misconduct in the expedition against the Vandals of Africa has already been mentioned.^t Basiliscus, who was supported by the Monophysite party, recalled Timothy *Ælurus* from banishment, and restored him to the see of Alexandria;^u he also restored to Antioch Peter “the Fuller,” A.D. 475. a Monophysite, who had been twice expelled from the see in the reign of Leo; and he took it upon himself to issue an encyclic or circular letter, condemning the Council of Chalcedon, and laying down definitions as to faith—the first document of the kind which had been put forth by any emperor.^x Timothy of Alexandria,

ⁿ Hard. ii. 689; Liberat. 15. See Walch, vi. 685.

^o Hard. ii. 732; Evagr. ii. 9; Pagi, viii. 217-8; Neand. iv. 233-4.

^p The ancient Cherson was near the site of Sebastopol, a place which, since the first publication of this volume, has become memorable in our own history. It was the seat of a Greek republic, which preserved its independence until the Emperor Theophilus, in the ninth century, compelled it to receive a go-

vernor from Constantinople. See Finlay, ii. 415.

^q Evagr. ii. 11; Tillem. xv. 813, 821-3. The meaning of *Salophaciolus* is unknown. Vales. n. on Evag.

^r Evag. ii. 17.

^s Ib. iii. 1; Tillem. Emp. vi. 475-6.

^t P. 487. Gibbon, iii. 449.

^u Liberatus, 16.

^x Evagr. iii. 4; Schröckh, xviii. 508; Neand. iii. 191; iv. 234.

Peter of Antioch, and, it is said, about five hundred other bishops, subscribed the edict.^y But Acacius, who, in 471, had become patriarch of Constantinople, displayed on this occasion a vehemence which contrasts strongly with the equivocating and courtly policy of his ordinary conduct as to matters of religion. Perhaps, as has been suggested, Acacius may have been animated in his opposition to Basiliscus, not only by zeal for the faith of Chalcedon, but by a regard for the privileges which the council had bestowed on his see, and by attachment to the emperor to whom he had owed his elevation. He arrayed his person and his church in

A.D. 476.

mourning, and by his preaching excited the monks and people of the capital against the usurper. Both Basiliscus and the patriarch sent envoys to Daniel the Stylite,^z who had succeeded Symeon as the most revered oracle of the time. Warned by a vision, Daniel descended from his pillar, and appeared in Constantinople; he confirmed the orthodoxy of the Council of Chalcedon by performing a number of miracles, denounced against Basiliscus the judgments of this world and the next, and did not leave the city until the usurper, alarmed at the report that Zeno was approaching, and was supported by the whole Catholic party,

A.D. 477.

published a second edict, revoking his circular, anathematizing Eutyches as well as Nestorius, and approving the Council of Chalcedon.^a It is said that Basiliscus fled for safety to a church, and that the patriarch, disregarding the example of his great predecessor Chrysostom,^b gave up the unhappy man to the relentless vengeance of Zeno.^c

Things were now again changed. Most of the bishops who had signed the circular of Basiliscus eagerly went over to the opposite party.^d Peter the Fuller was ejected from Antioch, and Ælurus would have been ejected from Alexandria but that his advanced age promised a speedy vacancy in the see. On his death,^e which happened before the end of 477, Peter Mongus was irregularly consecrated as patriarch by two deprived bishops, if not by a single bishop. The emperor deposed, but did not banish him,^f and Salo-

^y Evagr. iii. 5; Tillem. xv. 295.

^z See p. 341.

^a Evagr. iii. 6-7; Theod. Lect. i. 32-3; Sym. Metaphrast. Vita Dan. in Surius, vi. 860-2; Tillem. xvi. 285, 289-300; Walch, vi. 709, 723-4; Schröckh, xviii. 509.

^b See p. 383.

^c Procop. de B. Vandal. i. 7, p. 195; Anon. Valesian. ad calc. Amm. Mar-

cellini, 663; Baron. 477. 2. It must be remembered that the subsequent quarrel of Acacius with Rome has exposed him to hard treatment by writers in the Roman interest.

^d Evagr. iii. 9; Neand. iv. 236.

^e Evagr. iii. 8. His enemies said that he poisoned himself. Liberat. 16.

^f Evagr. iii. 11; Tillem. xvi. 309-310.

phaciolus was reinstated.^g This patriarch administered his office with a mildness which drew from the emperor admonitions to be more rigid in suppressing the meetings of the Monophysites ; while with these he was so popular that, on meeting him in the streets, they used to express their regard for him, and their regret at being obliged to stand aloof from his communion.^h On his death, in 482, John Talaia, steward of the church, was elected to the patriarchate ; but the emperor objected to him on account of his connexion with Illus, an officer who had lately revolted. Talaia was expelled, and took refuge at Rome ; and Peter Mongus renewed his pretensions to the see of Alexandria.ⁱ

The doctrines of the Monophysites had by degrees been so greatly improved from the original Eutychianism that the idea of reconciling the party with the Catholics might now appear not unreasonable or hopeless.^k By the advice of Acacius, A.D. 482. Zeno put forth a document bearing the title of "Henoticon" or *Form of Union*, which was originally addressed to the Egyptian patriarchate, but was afterwards made a standard for other churches also.^l In this, the emperor, after alluding to the discords, the bloodshed, the destitution of the means of grace, and other unhappy consequences which had resulted from the late controversies, declares the creed of Nicæa and Constantinople to be the only *baptismal* creed, anathematizes Nestorius and Eutyches, and approves of Cyril's twelve anathemas. He states that Christ is "consubstantial with the Father as touching his Godhead, and with us as touching his manhood ;" that "the miracles and the sufferings were of one and the same Person." He reprobates those who "divide, confuse, or introduce the notion of a phantasm ;" he anathematizes "any one who thought or thinks anything to the contrary, either now or at any other time, either at Chalcedon or in any other synod whatsoever."^m The document was composed in the belief that the doctrine of Chalcedon would of itself be received without objection in quarters where the name of the council was obnoxious ; and, while it avoided the expression "in two natures," and the confirmation of the council, it set forth those points of doctrine as to which both parties were agreed. But the care which was taken to consult the prejudices of the Monophysites

^g Baron. 477. 6-20 ; Tillem. xvi. 313-320. Tillem. xvi. 327.

^h Liberatus, 16.

ⁱ Ib. 17 ; Tillem. xvi. 320-4.

^j See Walch, vii. 37-40.

^k Evagr. iii. 13 ; Baron. 482. 31-2 ;

^l This word refers to the opinion ascribed to Eutyches, p. 505.

^m Evagr. iii. 14 ; Walch, vi. 773-7 ; Gieseler, I. ii. 356-7.

naturally rendered it objectionable to the Catholics; and the mention of Chalcedon, although only in a hypothetical form, appeared to go somewhat beyond a neutrality, as if a slight to the council were intended. At Rome, especially, no approbation was to be expected, inasmuch as the bishop had not been consulted on the occasion, and as there was no mention of Leo's Letter to Flavian.^o

It was intimated to Peter Mongus, that, on condition of subscribing the Henoticon,^p and of admitting the Proterians to communion, he might be allowed to hold the bishoprick of Alexandria. To these terms he consented; and the great body of the Catholics submitted to him, while the extreme Eutychians formed a separate sect, which, as being without a head, received the name of Acephali.^q Peter endeavoured to gain these by anathematizing the Council of Chalcedon and the Letter to Flavian; it is even said, that with the same view he disinterred the body of Salophaciolus.^r In answer to a remonstrance from Acacius, he said that he had accepted the Council of Chalcedon as containing no innovation on the faith, but he did not deny that he had acted with a tortuous policy.^s While he laboured by such means, but with very little success, to conciliate the Acephali, Peter exercised great severity towards such of the Catholics as refused to communicate with him.^t

Peter was received into communion by Acacius, and by Martyrius of Jerusalem; and the patriarch of Constantinople wrote in his behalf to Rome.^u The interest of Rome had in the meantime been gained by the expelled bishop of Alexandria, John Talaia. Two successive popes, Simplicius and Felix, addressed letters in favour of him both to the emperor and to Acacius;^x but the patriarch in reply assured Felix that Peter was a rightly-chosen and orthodox bishop, and Zeno threw out charges of perjury against John.^y Acacius won over two legates of Felix, and persuaded

^o Mosh. i. 494; Walch, vi. 814-9; Schröckh, xviii. 514-6. The Henoticon, however, was never *condemned* at Rome. See Walch, vi. 804-5.

^p Walch (vi. 783, 819) supposes the form to have been drawn up by a compromise between Acacius and the envoys of Mongus.

^q Evagr. iii. 12-4.

^r Evagr. iii. 16. Peter denied the charge of violating his predecessor's grave (ib. 17), but Tillemont (xvi. 346) believes it. See Walch, vi. 844.

^s Evagr. iii. 17; Liberat. 18, col. 1029.

^u Tillem. xvi. 346.

^x Evagr. iii. 16; Liberat. 18.

^y See Patol. lviii. Felix, who became pope in March, 483, is usually styled the Third of his name, although this reckoning involves the recognition of the Felix intruded by the Arians in the time of Liberius (see p. 224). Tillem. xvi. 337-9.

^z Evagr. iii. 15, 21; Tillem. xvi. 335-7, 340-4, 350-1. It is said that when John was on a mission to Constantinople, a short time before the death of Salophaciolus, the emperor made him swear not to accept the bishoprick. The au-

them to be present at a service in which the name of Peter was recited in the diptychs—an act by which they seemed to give the sanction of Rome to his tenure of the Alexandrian patriarchate.^z For this compliance, the legates, on their return home, were tried before an Italian synod, which deposed and excommunicated them; and the synod proceeded to condemn Acacius, whom Felix had previously cited to appear at Rome and give an account of his communicating with Peter Mongus.^a The sentence was intimated to Acacius in a letter from Felix and other A.D. 484. bishops, declaring him to be deposed, degraded, and separated from the number of the faithful, as having been condemned by the judgment of the Holy Spirit and by Apostolical authority, so that he should never be unloosed from the anathema pronounced against him.^b The Roman bishop would probably not have ventured on this unexampled proceeding, but that the reign of Odoacer in Italy had encouraged him to disregard the emperor of the East. The Greeks complained of the irregularity with which it was conducted as well as of the assumption which it involved. Acacius took no other notice of it than by removing the name of Felix from the diptychs of Constantinople.^c

The deposition of Acacius was announced by Felix to the clergy and people of Constantinople, and it was declared that all who should not separate from the patriarch were cut off from the communion of Rome.^d A great number of monks, including the Acœmetæ, a society of especial sanctity,^e preferred the connexion

thority for this is Zacharias, a Monophysite, quoted by Evagrius, iii. 12. Tillemont (xvi. 321-2) supposes that the oath may rather have been not to *intrigue* for the election.

^z Evagr. iii. 21; Tillem. xvi. 348-9, 352.

^a Evagr. iii. 18-21; Baron. 484. 11; Tillem. xvi. 344, 353-4, 765-6; Walch, vi. 915. There is a question whether the condemnation and the deposition of Acacius were the work of one or of two synods. See Pagi, viii. 444, 486.

^b Hard. ii. 831-2; Walch, vi. 866-8, 910, 927. Gelasius, the successor of Felix, laboured to explain these last words as meaning that Acacius could not be absolved until he should own his fault and ask pardon (*De Anathematis Vinculo*, Patrol. lix. 108, seqq.); but Tillemont (xvi. 359) remarks that they were not necessary if this were all that was intended.

^c Pagi, viii. 445; Tillem. xvi. 356-7,

362-3; Mosheim, i. 496; Schröckh, xviii. 519-520. A patriarch was properly amenable only to a general or other great council; but it was pretended that Acacius fell under the condemnation of the council of Chalcedon, as having communicated with persons whose opinions were there condemned. See Gelas. Ep. 11 (Patrol. lix.); Baron. 492. 18-9; Walch, vi. 918.

^d Epp. 10-1 (Patrol. lviii.).

^e The founder of these was Alexander, who died about 428 or 430. The peculiarity of the Acœmetæ (or *sleepless*) was, that they were divided into classes, which by turns kept up an unintermitted course of worship. Alexander was not beyond the suspicion of heretical connexions, and for this or other reasons he is not reckoned among the saints; but his order was distinguished for its orthodoxy. See Pagi, viii. 230; Tillem. tom. xii. art. *Alexandre*.

of Rome to that of their own bishop;^f so that division was thus introduced into the very church of the Eastern capital. The schism which ensued lasted five and thirty years, and the precipitancy with which the excommunication was pronounced was equalled by the rigour with which it was carried out—the bishops of Rome treating the whole East as heretical for refusing to break with Acacius, although he himself had not been charged with heresy, but only with the secondary offence of communicating with alleged heretics.^g Tillemont remarks that later popes have been glad to invoke the intercession of saints whom, when alive, their predecessors rejected from communion.^h

Within a few years, the chief persons who had been concerned in the Monophysite troubles, were removed from the scene. The last days of John Talaia were spent in an Italian bishoprick, which had been bestowed on him by Felix.ⁱ Peter the Fuller—who in 485 had been established in the see of Antioch on signing the Henoticon, and had been acknowledged by his namesake of Alexandria, although Acacius evaded a recognition of him—died in 488;^k and Acacius, in the following year.^l Fravitta, the suc-

cessor of Acacius, held the patriarchate for only four months, and was succeeded by Euphemius, an orthodox bishop, who renounced the communion of Peter Mongus, and was preparing for a contest with him, when the patriarch of Alexandria died.^m At the death of Zeno, in 491, the Church, instead of having been united by his Henoticon, was divided into three great parties:—Antioch, under Palladius, and Alexandria, under Athanasius, were Monophysite; Jerusalem was with Constantinople; while Rome and the West stood aloof.ⁿ

Anastasius, on whom the daughter of Leo and widow of Zeno bestowd her hand and the empire, had already attained
A.D. 491–518. the age of sixty, and reigned twenty-seven years. Before his elevation he bore a high character for piety; and his general reputation is attested by the cry with which he was greeted—"Reign as you have lived!"^o He was, however, suspected by the patriarch Euphemius, who refused to consent to his promotion, except on receiving a written assurance that no innovation should be attempted in the matter of religion, and that the

^f Tillem. xvi. 360; Dupin, iv. 258; Gieselcr, I. ii. 358. ♦

^g See Pagi, ix. 24.

^h Tillem. xvi. 356, 366, 372, 642.

ⁱ Liberat. 18; Col. 1027.

^j Tillem. xvi. 365-7.

^k Pagi, viii. 501.

^l Tillem. xv. 397, 633.

^m Tillem. xvi. 388, 633; Gibbon, iv. 359; Walch, vi. 931.

ⁿ Cedren. 357; Gibbon. iii. 450.

council of Chalcedon should be maintained.^p It is said that some of the emperor's relations were Arians and Manichæans; and by many writers he is charged with the errors of those sects, as well as with that of the Monophysites, whose interests were favoured by the result, if not by the intention of his policy.^q Yet his orthodoxy has been warmly defended; and his principle of action has been characterised as impartiality rather than indifference.^r Anastasius professed to aim at peace, and to abhor the idea that persons who believed in Christ, and bore the name of Romans, should be vexed on account of their opinions.^s Evagrius tells us that, under him, the council of Chalcedon was neither openly preached nor wholly rejected; that the bishops took different courses with respect to it; and that the emperor, in his desire to check all innovation, ejected those who introduced into their dioceses a change in either direction.^t Throughout the reign the eastern patriarchates continued to be unquiet, and the Henoticon was the test generally prescribed—a test to which all but the extreme members of the opposite parties were willing to submit, but which was insufficient to insure harmony among those who subscribed it. The dissensions of the clergy among themselves obliged Anastasius to depart so far in practice from his principle of peace or indifference, that to the Catholics he appeared a persecutor, and his name is marked with especial detestation by the orthodox historians. Tales of impiety which savour strongly of fiction are related of him; miracles and portents are said to have declared the wrath of heaven against him; and his end is described with circumstances of horror.^u

Euphemius, of Constantinople, was deposed and banished in 496; his successor, Macedonius, in 511 or 512. Although the ejection of Euphemius was ostensibly grounded on political charges,^x it is probable that in both cases the patriarchs had offended by refusing to enter into the policy of the court as to religion.^y Alexandria was held by a succession of bishops who rejected the council of Chalcedon, but were yet unable to reduce

^p Evagr. iii. 32; Tillem. Emp. vi. 533-4. This is said to be the earliest approach to a coronation-oath (Lingard, A. S. C., ii. 28). Theodore the Reader states that Anastasius forcibly got possession of the paper again. ii. 8.

^q Tillem. Emp. vi. 531.

^r Walch, vi. 947-8, 1043; Schröckh, xviii. 523. Tillemont (xvi. 636-7) thinks that he really held with the Acephali, and that, having begun with a policy of

indifference, he afterwards gave vent to his predilection for heresy.

^s Symmach. Ep. 10 (Patrol. lxii. 70).

^t Evagr. iii. 30.

^u Baron. 518. 16-9; Schröckh, xvi. 22; xviii. 529, 530, 533; Victor Tunun. A.D. 518 (Patrol. lxviii.).

^x "Falso damnatus." Marcellin, A.D. 496 (Patrol. li.).

^y Evagr. iii. 32; Tillem. xvi. 660, 690, 810.

the Acephali to their communion.^z In the patriarchate of Antioch, the religious agitations of the time occasioned much tumult and bloodshed. Flavian, one of its bishops, was banished in 512, although, in order to clear himself from the charge of Nestorianism, he had gradually yielded to anathematize, not only Nestorius, but Diodore, Theodore, Theodoret, Ibas, and, finally, the council of Chalcedon.^a Elias, of Jerusalem, who in like manner had made large concessions, was nevertheless deposed in the following year.^b Throughout the reign of Anastasius, Rome remained in separation from the East. The overtures of Euphemius and the emperor were met with unbending haughtiness by Gelasius, who filled the see from 492 to 496.^c The next bishop, Anastasius II., opened communications with Constantinople in a tone of conciliation; it is said that he was willing, for the sake of peace, even to admit that

the name of Acacius should remain in the diptychs.
Nov. 498. But his death put a stop to the negotiation,^d and his successor, Symmachus, exchanged with the eastern emperor messages of defiance and accusations of heresy.^e

Severus, a monk,^f who afterwards became patriarch of Antioch on the deprivation of Flavian, introduced at Constantinople an addition which Peter the Fuller had made to the Trisagion—the words, “Who was crucified for us.”^g In consequence of this a

^a Tillem. xvi. 638.

^b Evagr. iii. 31–2. Baronius (512. 30) attempts to deny that Flavian gave up the council.

^c Vita S. Sabb. ap. Labb. et Coss. vii. 88–9; Theophan. ed. Paris, 134; Tillem. xvi. 719–720.

^d Gelas. Epp. 1, 8 (Patrol. lix.).

^e Much to the delight of Baronius, 497. 28. See Anast. Ep. 1, ap. Labb. ii. 1278; Theod. Lector, ii. 17; Anast. Bibliothecar. Patrol. cxxviii. 439; Tillem. xvi. 637–642, 650–9, 665–8.

^f Symmach. Ep. 10 (Patrol. lxii.); Baron. 503. 18, seqq.; Tillem. xvi. 671–4.

^g Severus, after having been a heathen and an advocate, became a monk, but was turned out of a monastery for his monophysite opinions, which were carried to the extent of rejecting the Henoticon, so that he is described as Acephalous. (Liberat. 19; Tillem. xvi. 682; Walch, vi. 982.) It is said that on his elevation to the see of Antioch, he promised to sign the Henoticon, but did not keep his engagement (Walch, vi. 1021–2). He is described as a man of great ability, but is charged not only

with severities against the Catholics, but with embezzling ornaments and other property of the Church. Evagr. iv. 4; Schröckh, xviii. 536. See Dörner, ii. 166–172.

^h The angelic song of “Holy, Holy, Holy” (Isaiah vi. 3), received a development at Constantinople in the episcopate of Proclus, when it is said that, as the people were engaged in prayer on account of an earthquake, a child was miraculously caught up, and, after an hour, returned, declaring that he had heard the heavenly host singing ἅγιος ὁ Θεός, ἅγιος ἰσχυρὸς, ἅγιος ἀθάνατος. To this form Peter, while yet a presbyter, added the words ὁ σπαραγμὸς δι’ ἡμᾶς. Calandion, one of the Catholic patriarchs who intervened between Peter’s occupations of the see of Antioch, made the further addition, “our Lord Jesus Christ;” but Peter rejected this. His form was adopted by Catholics, until the Council “in Trullo” (A.D. 691?) condemned it; after which it was used only by Monophysites and Monothelites. While its advocates referred the whole to the Second Person of the Godhead, its opponents maintained that the triple

serious collision took place between the Catholics and the Monophysites of the capital, during the episcopate of Macedonius; but after his deposition one of still more alarming character arose.^b By order of the emperor, two prefects entered a church, ascended the pulpit or screen, and began to chant the Trisagion with the Antiochene addition; whereupon a tumult ^{A.D. 512.} ensued, many persons were killed, and a number of Catholics were committed to prison. On the following day a fresh conflict took place; and the disturbance came to its height on the occasion of a solemn procession, which took place on the third day. Timothy, the Monophysite successor of Macedonius, had given orders that the new clause should be used. Those who obeyed him were met by bands of the Catholic monks, chanting the Trisagion in its old form; the parties fell to blows; the populace of the city mixed in the fray, and many lives were lost. Among the slain were a female recluse, and a monk who was suspected of having suggested the performance of the prefects to the emperor; the monk's head was cut off, stuck on a pole, and carried in procession as that of an enemy to the Trinity. Houses were sacked and burnt; the emperor's pictures and statues were defaced and thrown down; there were cries for a new emperor. Anastasius, then more than eighty years of age, withdrew from the city; but after three days he presented himself in the circus without the ensigns of sovereignty, when the multitude, by way of insult, received him by shouting the orthodox Trisagion. He addressed them by a herald, professing himself willing to abdicate, but reminding them that they could not all reign, and that they must make choice of one for their emperor. The people were moved by his words, and by the sight of his humiliation; he promised to gratify them with the blood of the obnoxious prefects, and resumed the government.ⁱ

"Holy" denoted the Three Persons, and had been given through Isaiah as an intimation of the mystery of the Trinity (Joh. Damascen. de Hymno Trisagio, Opera, i. 482). Hence Pope Felix III. charges Peter with the Manichæan error of saying that the Holy Spirit was crucified; and the name of *Theopaschites* or *Deipassiani* was given to his followers, as if they maintained that God suffered; while another charge was, that they added a Fourth Person to the Trinity. See Felix III. Ep. 3 (Patrol. lviii. 910); Conc. Trull. c. 81; Joh. Damasc. i. 480-497; Theophanes, 207; Tillem.

xvi. 310, 319, 376; Walch, vi. 489, 798, 850; vii. 238; Gieseler, I. ii. 355, 366; Dörner, ii. 155.

^b Evagrius (iii. 44) speaks of only one tumult. So Neander, iv. 241. But Pagi (ix. 97-100, 117-120) and Tillemont give reasons for thinking that there were two. xvi. 687-9, 810.

ⁱ Marcellinus, A.D. 512 (Patrol. li.); Victor Tunun. (ib. lxviii. 951); Theophan. ed. Par. 136. Gibbon (iv. 360-1) speaks as if the prefects had been put to death. But it appears that Anastasius did not find it necessary to fulfil his promise or oath. Tillem. xvi. 700.

The last years of the reign were disquieted by the insurrection of Vitalian, a Scythian or Gothic chief, who took arms A.D. 511-6. for the Catholic faith, devastated Thrace, and threatened Constantinople. He required that the banished orthodox bishops should be restored; that the Council of Chalcedon should be acknowledged; that communion with Rome should be resumed, and that a new General Council should be called, at which the pope should assist. To these terms the emperor at length submitted; but the exorbitant demands of Hormisdas, the successor of Symmachus, prevented any accommodation between the east and the west during the lifetime of Anastasius.^k The emperor died in 518,^l and was succeeded by Justin, an aged soldier of Slavonic race, in whose name the government was really administered by his nephew Justinian.^m Vitalian, after having been promoted to the highest offices by the new sovereign, was in the seventh A.D. 520. month of his consulship treacherously assassinated at the imperial table; and Justinian is suspected of having contrived his murder.ⁿ

Timothy, patriarch of Constantinople, had died a short time A.D. 518. before the emperor Anastasius. When his successor, July 15. John, appeared in the cathedral on the first Sunday after the accession of Justin, he was greeted with loud outcries, that, since the Manichæan Anastasius no longer reigned, the council of Chalcedon should be confirmed, Severus of Antioch with the rest of the "Manichæans" should be expelled, and a reconciliation should be established with Rome.^o The new government was disposed to comply with the popular desire; Severus and other Monophysites were deprived, and for the most part took refuge at Alexandria, where their party was so strong that the emperor did not venture to excite the unruly population by any attempt against it.^p But the concourse of Monophysite teachers had the effect of producing or bringing to light differences among themselves; and many of them branched off into minor sects—such as Agnoëtes, Aphthartodocetes, and Niobites—whose tenets and history need not be here detailed.^q

^k See the correspondence in *Patrol.* lxiii. ; *Evagr.* iii. 43; *Baron.* 515. 19-36; 516. 1-19; 517. 1-48; *Gibbon*, iii. 483; iv. 361.

^l He is said to have been struck by lightning. *Vict. Tunun.* A.D. 518.

^m *Evagr.* iv. 2; *Anon. Vales.* ad calc. *Amm. Marcell.* 668; *Gibbon*, iii. 482; *Finlay*, i. 236.

ⁿ *Marcellin.* A.D. 520; *Vict. Tunun.*

Patrol. lxviii. 953; *Gibbon*, iii. 483.

^o *Conc. Cpol.* sub Menna, A.D. 536, *Labbe. et Coss.* v. 177, seqq.

^p *Evagr.* iv. 4; *Walch*, vii. 185; *Schröckh*, xviii. 536.

^q *Liberatus*, 19; *Pagi*, ix. 267; *Schröckh*, xviii. 538; *Gieseler*, I. ii. 360-3. *Walch* (viii. 520, seqq.) devotes about 300 unreadable pages to these varieties.

Fresh overtures were now made from Constantinople to Hormisdas of Rome, and all his demands were granted.^r The names of Acacius and his four successors who had died during the schism, with those of the emperors Anastasius and Zeno, were removed from the diptychs. The orthodox confessors Euphemius and Macedonius were not distinguished from the heretical Fravitta and Timothy; but Acacius was more especially reprobated by an anathema. It was found, however, that many churches of the East were not so ready as that of Constantinople to abandon the memory of their late bishops; and, as Hormisdas required the sacrifice of all who had communicated with Acacius, the demand occasioned disturbances so serious that the imperial government and the patriarch repeatedly entreated the Pope to abate the rigour of his terms.^s Hormisdas at length agreed to empower the patriarch Epiphanius, the successor of John, to act for him in receiving the churches into communion.^t The matter was accommodated by the retention of some names on the diptychs; and eventually Euphemius and Macedonius, with Flavian of Antioch, Elias of Jerusalem, and some others who had died during the separation, were acknowledged by Rome as saints.^u The Henoticon, without being formally repealed, from this time disappeared; and everywhere except in Egypt the Council of Chalcedon was received.^x

II. About the same time when Anastasius ascended the throne of Constantinople, the sovereignty of Italy was transferred from the Herulians to the Ostrogoths. Theodoric, prince of the Amali, after having endangered the empire of Zeno, had received his permission to undertake the conquest of that country. He defeated Odoacer in three great battles, and, after having besieged him for three years in Ravenna, admitted him to a treaty on equal terms. But the Herulian king, on a pretended charge of conspiracy, was soon after stabbed at a banquet—perhaps even by the hand of his colleague and rival—and the Goths became sole masters of Italy.^y

After the death of Odoacer, Theodoric reigned thirty-three

^r Patrol. lxxiii. 425-458.

^s See Patrol. lxxiii. 487, 490, 498, 502, 508, 510.

^t Ep. 80 (Patrol. lxxiii.).

^u Tillem. xvi. 697; Walch, vii. 110-5. Pagi is noticeable on this point (ix. 235-6, 297-9).

^x Schröckh, xviii. 544.

^y Procop. de Bello Goth. i. 1; Anonym. Valesianus (i. e. a writer published by Adrien de Valois with Ammianus Marcellinus, Paris, 1681), 665; Jornandes, 57 (Patrol. lxxix.); Tillem. Emp. vi. 450-6, 519; Gibbon, iii. 453-6; Milman, Lat. Christ. i. 293.

years, with vigour and in prosperity.^z His dominions extended as far as the Danube, and he put a bar to the extension of the Frankish conquests under Clovis.^a His wisdom and justice were exerted for the establishment of equality between the victorious and the conquered races. Although he adhered to the Arian creed of his nation, he did not attempt to enforce it on others. "We cannot impose religion by command," he said, "since no one can be made to believe against his will."^b He employed Catholics as his ministers, and entrusted Catholic bishops with the most important embassies; he recognised the orthodox clergy in their position, bestowed munificent gifts on their churches, and, although indisposed to interfere in the internal concerns of the Church, he exercised a control over the bishops of Rome, which the later emperors of the West had through weakness allowed to escape from their hands.^c His toleration (as we have seen^d) did not extend to the allowance of Pagan rites; but it included the Jews, whom he steadily protected against the outrages of their Christian neighbours.^e

So long as Rome and Constantinople were separated by schism, Theodoric had no reason to distrust the loyalty of his Catholic subjects. But the reconciliation of the churches, in the beginning of Justin's reign, suggested to him that the Romans might be tempted to look towards the East for deliverance from the sway of a barbarian conqueror; and in no long time his anger and alarm were excited by the measures which Justin took for the purpose of establishing unity of religion. In 523 the emperor issued edicts by which it was ordered that Manichæans should be capitally punished; that other heretics, as well as Jews, Pagans, and Samaritans, should be excluded from civil or military employment; and that they should not be allowed to celebrate their worship.^f The Gothic soldiery of the empire were, indeed, exempted from this law; but Theodoric was bent on securing not only for his own nation, but for the oriental members of his sect, the same freedom of religion which he allowed to his Catholic subjects. He earnestly remonstrated with Justin by letter;^g and,

^z See Gibbon, c. 39; Milman, *Lat. Christ.* b. iii. c. 3.

^a Gibbon, iii. 458-469.

^b Cassiodorus, *Variarum*, ii. 27 (*Patrol.* lxi.); Anon. *Vales.* 666. Theodore the Reader relates that he beheaded a deacon who had thought to court his favour by turning Arian (ii. 18); but the story is rejected by Gibbon (iii. 470) and Dean Milman (*Lat. Christ.* i. 302).

^c Baron. 494. 57; Gibbon, iii. 469-471; Revillout, 300-3, 313; Milman, *L. C.* i. 301-2.

^d P. 489.

^e Cassiod. *Variar.* ii. 27; iii. 45; iv. 43; v. 37 (letters written by Cassiodorus in the king's name).

^f *Cod. Justin.* I. v. 12, 14.

^g Milman, *Lat. Christ.* i. 321.

as the reply was unsatisfactory, he despatched to Constantinople an embassy consisting of John, bishop of Rome, with five other bishops and four senators. It was the first ^{A.D. 525.} time that a pope had visited the eastern capital. John was received with unbounded reverence; almost the whole population of the city poured forth to greet his arrival, bearing torches and crosses in their hands, and the emperor cast himself at his feet. The patriarch of Constantinople yielded him precedence, and Justin submitted to a new coronation by the hands of the successor of St. Peter.^h But on his return to Italy, John was cast into prison, where he soon after died. The reasons of his imprisonment are matter of uncertainty and dispute; ^{A.D. 526.} the most probable opinion appears to be, that the bishop, although he successfully performed the other parts of his commission, had refused to ask that Arians who had professed Catholicism might be allowed to return to their heresy; and that the jealousy of Theodoric was also offended by the excessive honours which had been paid to his subject by the eastern court.ⁱ The dread of conspiracy against his rule had exasperated the aged king to gloomy and relentless suspicion of his Italian subjects, which had already been fatal to two of the most distinguished among them, Boëthius and Symmachus. Boëthius had enjoyed the highest honours of the state;^k in learning he surpassed all his contemporaries; his works embrace an extraordinary variety of subjects and modes of composition—history, poetry, theology, philosophy, music, mathematics, astronomy, and other branches of physical science. He had long enjoyed the favour of Theodoric; but his character, both as a patriot and as a Catholic, rendered his position hazardous; and the zeal with which he asserted the innocence of his friend Albinus, who was accused of a treasonable correspondence with the East, exposed him to a share in the accusation. A signature, which he declared to be forged, was produced against him; he was denied the opportunity of defending himself, and, a short time before the mission of John to Constantinople, was committed to a tower near Pavia, where he solaced himself by the composition of his famous books “On the Consolation of Philosophy.”^l After having been cruelly tortured, Boëthius was beaten

^h Marcellinus, A.D. 525; Anastas. 126; Gibbon, iii. 473.

ⁱ Anon. Vales. 671. See Baron. 525. 8-10 (who—although avowedly without any authority of ancient writers, except a letter forged in the name of John—maintains that the Pope acted in direct

opposition to his instructions); Pagi, ix. 349, 351; Schröckh, xvi. 102; xviii. 214-6; Gibbon, iii. 473; Revillout, 325-7; Milman, Lat. Christ. i. 321-3.

^k Boëth. de Consol. Philos. ii. Prosa 3 (Patrol. lxiii.).

^l The fact that this work of one who

to death with clubs, and his father-in-law, the venerable Symmachus, chief of the senate, on an apprehension that the desire of vengeance might tempt him to treason, was soon after summoned to Ravenna, and beheaded.^m Theodoric himself did not long survive. It is said that, in indignation at the result of the Byzantine mission, he went so far as to dictate an edict for the suppression of the Catholic worship in Italy; but, if the statement be true, it is certain that the law was not carried into effect.ⁿ But the feelings which the once just and tolerant king had aroused by the severities of his last days, are apparent from the stories connected with his death. Procopius tells us that he was haunted by a frightful vision, in which remorse called up before his eyes the form of the murdered Symmachus;^o and a legend to which the name of Gregory the Great gave currency and credit, related that a hermit on the island of Lipari had seen the Arian persecutor cast by Symmachus and Pope John into the crater of the volcano, which was supposed to be the entrance of hell.^p

III. In April, 527, Justinian was formally associated with his uncle as a colleague, and in August of the same year he became sole emperor, at the age of forty-five.^q Among the secular events of his long reign, the wars in Italy and in Africa had an important bearing on the history of religion.

Among the Vandals of Africa, the possession of the means of luxury had speedily proved fatal to that purity of manners which Salvian at an earlier time had indignantly contrasted with the depravity of his brethren who professed a sounder faith.^r The valour of the barbarians was undermined by the temptations of sensual enjoyment;^s the usurper Gelimer was dethroned by the arms of the imperial general, Belisarius; and some years later, on a rebellion of the Vandals and Moors, the country was completely subjugated.^t After the first conquest the Catholic Church was restored to its ascendancy,^u although

had defended the orthodox faith, contains nothing distinctively Christian, has often been remarked.

^m Pagi, ix. 337, 341, 355; Gibbon, iii. 474-8; Milman, Lat. Chr. i. 319-325.

ⁿ Dean Milman argues (L. Chr. i. 326) that the statement of the Anonymus Valsianus (p. 671) is "utterly irreconcilable with [Theodoric's] judicious and conciliatory conduct on the elevation of the Pope" Felix IV., in the month before his own death. On the whole, I can-

not but think that the Dean is somewhat partial to Theodoric.

^o Procop. de Bello Goth. i. 1. p. 310.

^p Greg. Dialog. iv. 30.

^q Gibbon, iii. 485.

^r De Gubern. Dei, vii. 20.

^s Procop. de Bello Vandal. ii. 6, p. 248; Rückert, i. 245-251.

^t Procop. de B. Vand.; Gibbon, iv. 3-23, 117-122.

^u Justin. Novell. 37.

the bishops were reduced to one-half or a third of their ancient number.^x It is reckoned that during the reign of Justinian Africa lost five millions of inhabitants; thus Arianism was extinguished in that region, not by an enforcement of conformity, but by the extermination of the race which had introduced and professed it.^y

The Ostrogoths of Italy, after the death of Theodoric, were distracted by factions and crimes.^z The military achievements of Belisarius and Narses in the peninsula threw a last and deceitful splendour over the power of the Eastern empire. The Gothic kings, Vitiges (537-9), Totila (546-552), and Teias (553), were successively defeated by these generals; the invasions of the Franks and the Alemanni were repelled;^a and from the year 554, Narses, with the title of exarch, administered the government of Italy, as a deputy of the emperor.^b The sufferings of the country during the revolutions of this period were greater than those which it has endured in any other of its calamities, whether earlier or later; the number of its inhabitants who perished by war, by famine, or in other ways, is supposed to have exceeded the whole of its modern population.^c With the Gothic monarchy, Arianism for a time disappeared from Italy.^d

Justinian lived strictly^e and spent much of his time in theological studies. He was fond of mixing in controversy and of acting as a regulator of religion; his subjects derided him for devoting himself to such matters, while he left the great political and military affairs of the empire to the management of his ministers and generals.^f He was munificent in his gifts for building churches and hospitals;^g but it is said that the means of this liberality were too commonly obtained by extortion, corrupt administration of justice, false accusations, and wrongful confiscation.^h The greatest architectural monument of his reign was the cathedral of the Eternal Wisdom (St. Sophia). This church had been originally

^x Only 217 could now be gathered for a council; Fleury, xxxii. 49.

^y Procop. Hist. Arcana, 18, p. 53; Gibbon, iv. 122.

^z Gibbon, iv. 34-42.

^a Procop. de B. Goth. See Gibbon, chaps. xli. xliii.; Finlay, i. 293-308.

^b Gibbon, iv. 149.

^c lb. 150, with Milman's note. Procopius mentions that many members of the Roman aristocracy were reduced to beg from door to door—among them,

the widow of Boëthius and daughter of Symmachus. De B. Goth. iii. 20.

^d Revillout, 349.

^e Procopius, however, says, that, while self-denying as to food, drink, and sleep, he was very dissolute. Hist. Arcana, 12, p. 39; 13, p. 41.

^f lb. 18, p. 55; De B. Goth. iii. 35, p. 349.

^g See Procop. de Edificiis.

^h Hist. Arcana, 8, 13, 14; Baron. 565. 7, and Pagi's notes; Evagr. iv. 30.

built by Constantine ; it had been destroyed by fire after the banishment of Chrysostom,¹ and, after having been then restored, was again burnt down in the tumult known by the name of

A.D. 532.

Nika.^k Justinian rebuilt it at a vast expense ;^l and as he cast his eyes around the magnificent structure on the day of the dedication, after expressing his thankfulness to God who had permitted him to accomplish so great a work, he ex-

A.D. 544.

claimed, "O Solomon, I have surpassed thee!"^m The dome of the church was afterwards shattered by an earthquake ;

A.D. 557.

but Justinian restored it with increased height and splendour, and performed a second dedication in the thirty-sixth year of his reign.ⁿ The establishment of the cathedral

A.D. 562.

was *limited* by one of his laws to sixty priests, a hundred deacons, forty deaconesses, ninety subdeacons, a hundred and ten readers, five and twenty singers, and a hundred ostiaries.^o

To the reign of Justinian is referred the extinction of philosophical heathenism. The Neoplatonists had until then continued to teach at Athens. They were obliged outwardly to respect the religion of the state ; but their esoteric doctrines were pagan, and their system, in its mysticism and in its pretensions to intercourse with higher powers, bore a curious resemblance to the superstitions which were at the same time growing on the Church.^p With a view to depriving paganism of its last support, Justinian, in 529, ordered that the schools of Athens should be closed ; whereupon Simplicius^q and six other philosophers, who were bereft of their occupation by the edict, feeling themselves insecure

A.D. 531.

within the imperial territories, resolved to emigrate to Persia and seek the patronage of King Chosroes, of whose enlightenment they had heard exaggerated celebrations, and whose subjects had been described to them as faultless models of every social virtue. They were well received by the king, but found their expectations grievously disappointed, and sighed for their native country, to which they eagerly desired to return, even at the risk of encountering persecution. In a treaty with Justinian,

¹ See p. 391.

^k For this sedition, which arose out of a quarrel between the blue and the green factions of the circus, see Procop. de B. Persico, i. 24 ; Gibbon, iii. 497.

^l By way of precaution against fire, no wood was used—the materials being bound together with iron. Agath. v. 9.

^m Codinus de Originibus Cpol. p. 71, ed. Paris ; Gibbon, iii. 520.

ⁿ Theophanes, 277, ed. Paris ; Pagi,

x. 209.

^o Novell. iii. c. 1. The reason of this limitation was, that bishops had been in the habit of ordaining clergy without considering whether the Church had the means of supporting them. There is a general law against the practice. Novell. vi. 8.

^p Gibbon, iii. 540 ; Neander, iv. 118 ; vi. 376-7 ; Gieseler, I. ii. 33.

^q See Neander, vi. 377-382.

Chosroes stipulated that they should be exempted from the penal laws against their religion; they lived unmolested during the remainder of their days, and left no disciples or successors.^r

In the same year with his order for closing the Athenian schools, the emperor enacted that no pagan or heretic should hold any civil or military office. They were allowed A.D. 529. three months to choose between conformity and banishment; or, if permitted to remain without abjuring their errors, they were to be deprived of all civil privileges. A great mass of pretended conversion was the result; while the edict produced a serious insurrection among the Samaritans,^s and many sectaries, who abhorred the hypocrisy of changing their religion at the emperor's command, were driven by desperation to suicide. The most noted act of this kind was performed by some Montanists in Phrygia, who shut themselves up in their meeting-houses, set fire to them, and perished in the flames.^t

Although Justinian was a partisan of the council of Chalcedon, his wife Theodora, whom he raised to the position of a colleague in the empire,^u was a zealous Monophysite. As her influence over her husband was unbounded in all other respects, it has been suggested that this division of theological interests may have been a matter of politic arrangement between the imperial pair.^v Theodora assembled a party of Monophysites at Constantinople; she prevailed on Justinian to invite Severus to A.D. 535. the capital; she even promoted Anthimus, a secret enemy of the Council of Chalcedon, to the patriarchate.^x In the year A.D. 536. after this appointment, Agapetus, bishop of Rome, was obliged by the Gothic king Theodahat to undertake a mission to Constantinople, for the purpose of averting the threatened attack of Justinian. The mission failed of its political object; but, at the request of the Catholic party, Agapetus exposed to the emperor the heterodoxy of Anthimus, and obtained his deposition on the ground that he had been uncanonically translated from another see. Mennas, who was raised to the vacant chair, was

^r Agathias, ii. 30; Gibbon, iii. 540. Agathias has a curious passage on the exaggerations which were current as to the barbarian king's accomplishments, ii. 28.

^s Procop. Hist. Arc. ii. p. 35.

^t Ib. pp. 34-5. Compare a similar act under Leo the Isaurian, Theophanes, 614.

^u Gibbon, iii. 491. Dean Milman, in a note at p. 487 of that volume, gives a caution against implicitly believing "the extreme and disgusting depravity of

Theodora's early life" (which Gibbon relates with even more than his usual delight in such details), as the only authority for it is the "Secret History" of Procopius (cc. 9, 10, &c.)—"a virulent libel"—"the basest and most disgraceful work in literature." Comp. Pagi in Bar. x. 236.

^v Procop. Hist. Arc. 13, p. 40; Liberatus, 20 (Patrol. lxxviii.); Evagr. iv. 10.

^x Liberat. 20, col. 1036; Fleury, xxxii. 52; Walch, vii. 172-4.

consecrated by the pope, and soon after held a council, at which Anthimus, after an examination of his opinions, was found guilty of heresy and was excommunicated.^y

Agapetus died at Constantinople before the meeting of this council, and Vigilius, his archdeacon, who had accompanied him, was urged by Theodora to become a candidate for the papacy. The empress promised to support him with influence and with money, if he would condemn the Council of Chalcedon, and would communicate with Anthimus and other Monophysites; but before he could reach Rome, Sylverius, a subdeacon, son of pope Hormisdas, was elected.^z In the following year, while

A.D. 537.

Belisarius was besieged in Rome by the Goths, Sylverius was summoned to appear before him. The general's wife, Antonina, who was reclining on a couch, while Belisarius occupied a place at her feet, reproached him for having entered into a treasonable correspondence with the enemy. His attempts at a denial were overpowered by the production of written evidence; he was immediately stripped of the ensigns of his dignity, and was sent off by sea to the East,^a while Vigilius was elected in his room, and paid for the interest of Belisarius two hundred pounds of gold.^b Sylverius, after having been banished to Patara, in Lycia, was sent back to Italy by Justinian, in order to a fresh investigation of his case;^c but through the contrivance of the intruder he was seized and carried off to the island of Palmaria (Palmarola), where he died of starvation.^d Although, however, Vigilius had thus delivered himself from his rival, his position was one of much difficulty and danger; for he had made a secret compact with Theodora to labour against the Council of Chalcedon, while his public engagements bound him to an opposite line of conduct.^e

^y Hard. ii. 1257-62; Liberat. 21; Patrol. lxvi. 47, seqq.; Evagr. iv. 11; Baron. 536, 9. seqq.; 17, seqq.; 80-4, and Pagi's notes; Schröckh, xvi. 222, where it is shown, against Baronius, that the appointment of Mennas was not by papal authority. Comp. Barrow, 222; Walch, vii. 17-8, 180, 184; Neand. iv. 246.

^z Liberat. 22; Baron. 536. 133; Walch, vii. 224-6.

^a Liberat. 22; Anastas. 130; Pagi, ix. 568. Gibbon (iv. 50-1) and Lord Stanhope (Life of Belisarius, ed. 1. pp. 226-8) suppose Sylverius to have been guilty; but most writers think that the evidence against him was forged in consequence of a plot between Theodora and Antonina. See Dupin, v. 68; Fleury,

xxxii. 57; Walch, vii. 226; Schröckh, xvii. 226; Neander, iv. 247.

^b Liberat. 22. On this transaction Baronius (538. 12, seqq.) is remarkable. His attempts to clear away some part of the story are acknowledged by Pagi to be unsuccessful.

^c Baronius (540. 4-10) says that after the death of Sylverius, and some miracles wrought by his relics, Vigilius resigned the popedom, was legitimately reappointed to it, and thenceforth became another man; but Pagi shows that there is no ground for this story.

^d Liberat. 22; Baron. 539. 1-9; 540. 2.

^e Liberat. 22; Victor Tunun. Patrol. lxxviii. 563.

From about the year 520, the monasteries of Palestine had been agitated by disturbances on the subject of Origen's opinions, which were especially maintained by the members of the "New Laura" (a society founded by St. Sabbas, in the beginning of the century), while the other monks were for the most part violent Anti-Origenists. There had been censures, expulsions, frequent affrays, and considerable bloodshed.^f The patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem were unable to allay the differences, and Justinian was well pleased to receive an appeal in the matter. He published a letter to the patriarch Mennas, censuring certain doctrines extracted or inferred from Origen's writings; he A.D. 536. declared that these doctrines were borrowed from Plato and the Manichæans (apparently forgetting that Manes was later than Origen); and he desired the patriarch to bring the question before the Home Synod.^g By this body the opinions of Origen were again censured, and fifteen anathemas were pronounced against them.^h The imperial manifesto was subscribed by Vigilius and by the four patriarchs of the East;ⁱ but the course of ecclesiastical politics now took a curious and unexpected turn.

Theodore Ascidas, a monk of Origenistic opinions, who had been appointed to the bishoprick of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, but usually resided at Constantinople, had acquired great influence over Justinian. By some process of casuistry, he prevailed on himself to sign the anathemas against Origen; but he felt the necessity of diverting the emperor's mind from the dangerous direction which it had taken. Knowing Justinian's anxiety to reduce the Acephali^k to conformity, he told him that their opposition to the Council of Chalcedon did not arise from repugnance to its doctrines, but from its recognition of persons suspected of Nestorianism—such as Theodoret and Ibas; he therefore suggested that, by a condemnation of these bishops, with the reputed father of Nestorianism, Theodore of Mopsuestia, the prejudices of the party might be overcome, and they might be won to a reconciliation. As for the objection to condemning persons who had died in communion with the Church, it was (he said) removed by the

^f Baron. 532; 538. 29, seqq.; Pagi, ix. 441. 7; Fleury, xxxiii. 3; Mosh. ii. 44-5; Schröckh, xviii. 43.

^g Hard. iii. 243-281; Liberat. 23.

^h Hard. iii. 284-8. These anathemas were long supposed to have proceeded from the fifth general council; but it appears to be now agreed that they belong to a local synod under Mennas (see n. on

Mosheim, ii. 47). By some this is supposed to have been the same which condemned Anthimus in 536 (Walch, vii. 181, 673; Guericke, i. 486). Schröckh (xviii. 51) places it about 540; Pagi (ix. 584) in 543; and Gieseler (I. ii. 368) in 544.

ⁱ Liberat. 23.

^k See p. 510.

late precedent of the anathemas against Origen. By this suggestion Ascidas may have hoped not only to secure the important object of engaging the emperor in a new question, but doubly to gratify himself—as an Origenist, by proscribing the great master of literal interpretation, and as a Monophysite, by striking a blow at the authority of the Fourth General Council.¹

The device was in so far successful that, instead of controversies as to Origenism and Monophysitism, the general attention was soon occupied by a dispute whether certain writings a century old

were favourable to Nestorianism. Justinian published A.D. 544.

an edict in which he condemned Theodore of Mopsuestia and his works, Theodoret's writings in favour of Nestorius and against Cyril, and a letter from Ibas to a Persian named Maris. This letter, written under great exasperation, severely reflected on Cyril; but its orthodoxy as to doctrine had been expressly acknowledged at Chalcedon.^m The emperor, however, contrived to reconcile his condemnation of the letter with his profession of respect for the council, by the supposition that a forged document had been substituted for that which the fathers of Chalcedon had approved.ⁿ It was required that the edict should be subscribed by all bishops. Mennas signed it with the stipulation that he should be at liberty to retract his signature if the bishop of Rome should refuse to concur—a reservation of which he did not afterwards avail himself.^o The eastern bishops in general submitted, although the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, with many others, showed much reluctance to subscribe;^p the few who refused were banished. But in Africa, where the old independent spirit of the Church had been exercised in opposition to the temporal power during the century of Vandal oppression, the proposal met with a lively opposition.^q The African bishops protested against reopening questions which the council of Chalcedon had settled, or condemning persons who had died in the communion of the Church; and a like disposition to resist was displayed in other quarters. The commotions rose to such a height that Ascidas is said to have afterwards owned that he himself, and the Roman deacon Pelagius, who had been concerned in bringing the Origenistic question under the emperor's notice, deserved to be burnt alive as the authors of them.^r

¹ Liberat. 24; Evagr. iv. 38; Neand. 628). Gieseler, I. ii. 370.

iv. 249-253.

^m Labb. et Coss. iv. 661-682.

ⁿ Fragments of the edict are preserved by Facundus, Pro Defens. III. Capitulum, ii. 3; iv. 4 (Patrol. lxxvii. 561.

^o Facund. iv. 4; Baron. 546. 45-8.

^p Facund. iv. 4.

^q Baron. 546. 51-3.

^r Liberat. 24; Neand. iii. 248; iv. 253-5.

Vigilius, alarmed by these events and by the temper of his own clergy,^s refused to sign the edict, and was obliged by the emperor (who probably apprehended a new division ^{A.D. 545.} between the Eastern and Western Churches) to repair to Constantinople, where he was detained upwards of seven years.^t His legate Stephen, with other ecclesiastics of the west, who were then at Constantinople, had broken off communion with Mennas, on the ground that the patriarch ought not to have acted in the matter, except, as had been before agreed, in concert with the pope.^u Vigilius at first refused to communicate with Mennas, but was persuaded to an agreement with him by Theodora, who died in the year after the pope's arrival;^x and he bound himself to Justinian by a secret written engagement^y to condemn the "Three Articles,"^z—by which name the points in question as to Theodore, Theodoret, and Ibas were generally designated. The pope submitted the matter to a synod of seventy western bishops, which was held at Constantinople in 548; but as the African members steadily refused to lend themselves to his change of policy, it became evident that no favourable decision was to be obtained, and he broke up the assembly.^a He then endeavoured to gain the bishops individually, and sent forth a document known by the title of his "Judicatum," in which he attempted ^{A.D. 548.} to satisfy both parties—the Orientals, by condemning the Three Articles; the Latins, by professing that he did so without prejudice to the Council of Chalcedon.^b But in the latter object he was utterly disappointed. An African synod, under ^{A.D. 549.} Reparatus, of Carthage, excommunicated him;^c the Churches of Illyria and Dalmatia were roused to vehement opposition; the commotion reached as far as Gaul and Scythia; even some of the pope's own deacons, who had accompanied him to Constantinople, charged him with an abandonment of the Council of Chalcedon, and returned to agitate the West against him.^d

^s The Roman clergy, being at a loss how to act in the new differences, applied to the learned African deacon Ferrandus for advice, and were guided by his answer. Ferrand. Ep. 6 (Patrol. lxvii.); Walch, viii. 150.

^t Baron. 546. 55, seqq. He was in Sicily in 545, but did not reach Constantinople until January 25, 547. Pagi, x. 16-28; Walch, viii. 115, 163-5; Clinton; Jaffé.

^u Facund. iv. 4.

^x July, 548; Murât. Annali, iii. 415.

^y Walch, viii. 168-170.

^z *κεφάλαια, capitula*. As the usual translation of this word by *chapters* is likely to mislead, I have preferred the word *articles*. See Gieseler, I. ii. 370.

^a Facund. Præf. ad Def. III. Capit.; Liber c. Mocianum, col. 859; Neand. iv. 258.

^b Pagi, x. 33, 38; Schröckh, xviii. 579-580. Only fragments of the 'Judicatum' now exist. Patrol. lxxix. 34; Walch, viii. 175.

^c Vict. Tunun. A.D. 550; Pagi, x. 56.

^d Rusticus c. Acephalos (Patrol. lxvii.);

Facundus, bishop of Hermiane, in Africa, who had distinguished himself in the council at Constantinople, addressed to the emperor, in 549, an able and spirited defence of the Three Articles. He maintained the orthodoxy of Theodore of Mopsuestia; he argued that he, Theodoret, and Ibas, could not be condemned without impugning the Council of Chalcedon, and doing away with its authority against Eutychianism; and he plainly desired the emperor to take warning from a comparison between those of his predecessors who had left the decision of theological questions to the bishops, and those who had ventured to arrogate it to themselves.^e

The only means to which Vigilius could now look for deliverance from the perplexity in which he found himself, between the emperor's wishes on the one hand, and the determined opposition of his western brethren on the other, was a general council; he therefore proposed that such an assembly should be summoned, and withdrew his "Judicatum" until it should meet.^f Justinian assented; but, apprehending that the Pope might perhaps attempt some evasion under shelter of the council, he bound him by fresh obligations, which were confirmed by an oath on the nails of the

A.D. 551. Holy Cross and the Gospels, to exert all his power for the advancement of the imperial designs.^g He also put

forth a long and detailed profession of faith, which he required the pope and other bishops to sign.^h Vigilius refused, threatened to excommunicate those who should comply, and with Datius, arch-
 August, 551. bishop of Milan, who was especially strenuous in his refusal, took refuge in a church. A prætor was sent with a guard to seize him. The Pope placed himself under the altar, and, while the soldiers attempted to drag him out by his feet, his hair, and his beard, he clung so firmly to the pillars that some of them gave way, and the table would have fallen on him if some clerks had not supported it. On this the spectators of the scandalous scene broke forth into loud outcries, in which even some of the soldiers joined; and the prætor was shamed into desisting from his attempt.ⁱ Vigilius was induced by oaths of safety to leave the church, but, finding himself guarded in his
 Dec. 23, 551. lodging, he escaped with Datius and other companions by night to Chalcedon, and fled for sanctuary to the church of St. Euphemia—the same in which the General Council

Vigil. Ep. 14 (ib. lxix.); Facundus, iv. 3; Baron. 548. 2, seqq.

^e Lib. xii. 3-5.

^f Patrol. lxix. 115.

^g Juram. Vigilii, Patrol. lxix. 121.

^h Ib. 225, seqq.

ⁱ Vigil. Ep. 15 (Patrol. lxix. 55); Ep. Cler. Ital. ib. 117.

had held its sessions. At length, after many overtures from the emperor, he was persuaded to return to Constantinople.^k

While Vigilius was in retirement at Chalcedon, the patriarch Mennas died, and the see of Constantinople was con-
ferred on Eutychius, who had recommended himself to the emperor by discovering a scriptural precedent for the con-
demnation of deceased theologians—namely, the burning the bones of idolaters by Josiah.^m The Fifth General Council met at Constantinople in May, 553. It was attended by a hundred and sixty-five bishops, including all the eastern patriarchs; but from the West there were only five African bishops.ⁿ As the absence of Vigilius gave reason to apprehend a division in the Church, he was repeatedly summoned, and was urgently requested by the other patriarchs to attend; but he obstinately refused—sometimes on the plea of illness, sometimes alleging that faith had not been kept with him in obtaining a fair representation of the Western Church. He sent to the emperor a paper signed by himself and sixteen other bishops, and designated by the title of "Constitutum," in which he endeavoured to take a middle course, by condemning the writings which were in question, but without reflecting on the authors—even on Theodore of Mopsuestia.^o On this, Justinian caused the secret engagements which Vigilius had made with him to be laid before the council, and desired that the Pope might be excluded from the diptychs—professing at the same time a wish to remain in communion with the Roman see; and the council acted accordingly.^p The Three Articles were condemned, and an anathema was pronounced against all who should defend them or should pretend that they were countenanced by the Synod of Chalcedon.^q The memory of Theodoret and Ibas was spared; but Theodore was included in the condemnation of his writings. The four earlier General Councils were confirmed. The emperor's edicts relating to matters of religion were approved; but, except by this indirect implication, it does not appear that the opinions of Origen were censured or noticed.^r

^k Vigil. Ep. 15; Pagi, x. 74; Schröckh, xviii. 595.

^m Evagr. iv. 38.

ⁿ Reparatus, of Carthage, had gone to Constantinople for the purpose of attending the council, but, as it was found that he would not comply with Justinian's wishes, he was banished on a charge of a crime against the state. The court named a successor, who, before consecration, condemned the Three

Articles; and he was established in his see at the cost of some bloodshed. Other African bishops were successfully tampered with. Ep. Cler. Ital. 116; Walch, viii. 196-7.

^o Patrol. lxi. 67, seqq.

^p Baluz. Coll. Nova Concil. 1538-46.

^q Hard. iii. 194, 197-200; Evagr. iv. 38.

^r This, however, is questioned. See Baron. 553. 238-244, with Pagi's notes;

Some months later, Vigilius—pressed by the censure of the council, frightened by the punishment of some who opposed it,^s and influenced also by the success of the arms of Narses, which had secured Italy to the emperor—made a humiliating submission to the decisions of the assembly,^t in which he ascribed his past difference of opinion to the craft of the devil; and he repeated this

A.D. 554. in a longer paper, withdrawing all his acts on the other side. The emperor then granted him permission to return to his see; but before reaching it, he died at Syracuse.^u

Jan. 555. His archdeacon, Pelagius, succeeded through the influence of Justinian, who on this occasion for the first time assumed for the imperial crown the privilege of confirming the election;^x but—whether from the odium attached to him as a partaker in the late Pope's policy, or because (according to another account) he was suspected of having contributed to the sufferings and death of Vigilius—he could not find more than two bishops willing to consecrate him. It is said that, in order to dissipate the suspicions which were entertained against him, he ascended the pulpit of St. Peter's, and swore on the Gospels and the cross, that he had no share in the misfortunes of his predecessor.^y

Pelagius adhered to the late council, and, with the aid of Narses, enforced the acceptance of it by deprivation, A.D. 555-9. banishment and other penalties.^z But in the West—where the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia were unknown, where the reliance of the Nestorians on his name was not actually seen, and could not beget a prejudice against him, where the condemnation of Theodoret and Ibas was chiefly regarded as endangering the authority of the Council of Chalcedon—the decisions of the Fifth Council were very generally resisted, even by those who were subjects of the empire. The bishops of the Italian diocese separated from Rome on this account; A.D. 570-580. and, although Milan and Ravenna were soon forced, by

Mosh. ii. 47, and notes; Walch, viii. 281-291; Schröckh, xviii. 57-8, 600; Neand. iv. 381-2; Gieseler, I. ii. 372.

^s Anastasius (Patrol. cxxvii. 580), followed by Nat. Alex. (x. 51), Baronius (353. 223), and Pagi (ib.; Patrol. cxxvii. 610), says that Vigilius was himself banished; but this seems to be very questionable.

^t Hard, iii. 214-244. The behaviour of Vigilius naturally exercises the ingenuity of Baronius, who defends him from the charge of inconsistency on the ground that, as the question was not one of faith, the pope might rightly act in

each stage of it as for the time seemed best (553. 230-7). The council, he says, although in itself undeserving of respect, acquired the authority of a general council by being acknowledged by Vigilius or Pelagius (553. 224, 229). Comp. the remarks on the whole controversy, 546. 38-40; 547. 29-30, 46-7.

^u See Pagi and Mansi, in Baron, x. 153.

^x Pagi, x. 155. It had before been exercised by the Gothic kings. Ibid. See p. 549.

^y Anastas. 59.

^z See his letters to Narses, Patrol. lxi. 393, seqq.; to Valerian, 414; Baron. 556. 1-9, 12-5.

the terror of the Lombard invasion, to seek a reconciliation, the metropolitans of Aquileia, with the Istrian bishops, remained in separation for nearly a century and a half.^a

Among the variety of opinions which had sprung out of the Monophysite controversy, was one broached by Julian of Halicarnassus, while a refugee at Alexandria, in the reign of Justin.^b This teacher maintained that the Saviour's body was incorruptible; that it was exempt from death, even as Adam's body would have been, if he had retained his innocence;^c that it was the same before as after the resurrection; that his hunger, thirst, weariness, and the like, did not necessarily arise from the constitution of his human nature, but were feelings to which He voluntarily subjected Himself.^d From their fancy of incorruptibility the followers of Julian were called *Aphthartodocetæ*—a name which they retaliated on their opponents by that of *Phthartolatræ* (servants, or worshippers of the corruptible).^e Justinian, in his extreme old age, fell into the opinions of Julian—probably through the influence of Theodore Ascidas;^f and in January, 565, he published an edict asserting the Aphthartodocetic doctrine, and required all bishops to subscribe it. Eutychius of Constantinople, who refused on the ground that it reduced the whole Incarnation to a mere appearance, was expelled for his contumacy.^g Most of the eastern bishops said that they would follow Anastasius of Antioch, whose character was held in general estimation; and this patriarch strongly maintained, with arguments from Scripture and from the belief of the Church, that in all blameless affections the Saviour's body was like to ours. Anastasius was preparing for deprivation, and had composed a farewell letter to his flock, when the proceedings against the orthodox Nov. 14, 565. were brought to an end by the death of the emperor, at the age of eighty.^h

^a Until 698 or 701. There were, however, partial reconciliations from time to time. (Baron. 556. 116; 638. 4; 698. 8; Fleury, xxxiii. 54-6; xxxviii. 17; Gibbon, iv. 368; Gieseler, I. ii. 410.) It seems to have been at this time that the bishops of Aquileia assumed the title of patriarch. The patriarch of Aquileia was afterwards driven to fix himself at Grado; and, on the removal of his residence back to Aquileia, a new patriarchate of Grado was erected. Nat. Alex. x. 149; Thomassin, I. i. 21.

^b Liberatus, 19.

^c Dorner, ii. 160.

^d See Petav. de Inc. x. 3.

^e Liberat. 19; Schröckh, xviii. 610, 648-650.

^f Baron. 564. 6.

^g Baron. 563; 564. 5, 11; Pagi, x. 214-5. He was restored in 577, on the death of John, who had been put into his place. Baron. 578. 6, with Pagi's notes.

^h Evagr. iv. 40-1; Walch, viii. 590-9, 600-4; Neand. iv. 267-8. Mansi (in Bar. x. 232) contends that 566 was the year of Justinian's death.

Monophysitism, when discountenanced by the emperors, continued to exist in countries beyond their dominions, and also among the populations of Syria and Egypt.

The Armenians had been under the Persian yoke since the year 369.ⁱ After long resistance to attempts at enforcing the Magian religion on them, they had been allowed to preserve their Christianity. But they were still liable to persecution; and whereas a community of religion had formerly obtained for them the alliance of the Romans, they found that a Christianity different from that authorised by the emperors was a recommendation to the favour of their new masters. Interest, therefore, concurred with other motives in leading them to the adoption of a Monophysite creed. At the synod of Thwin, which by some writers is placed in 536, and by others in 595,^k the Armenian Church condemned the council of Chalcedon, and to this day it holds the Aphthartodocetic doctrine as to the body of our Lord.^m

In Syria, where the Monophysite bishops and clergy had been removed by exile, imprisonment, and other means of persecution, a monk named Jacob undertook the enterprise of preserving his party from extinction. He sought out some Monophysite prelates who were imprisoned at Constantinople, and received from them consecration as bishop of Edessa, with a commission of general superintendence over the interests of their cause throughout the East.ⁿ In the dress of a beggar, from which he derived the name of *Al Baradai* (the ragged), he travelled indefatigably over Syria and Mesopotamia—secretly reviving the zeal of the Monophysites, organising them into a combined body, and ordaining bishops and clergy for them. At his death, in 578, he left a large and flourishing communion, headed by a patriarch who laid claim to the throne of Antioch; and, although much diminished in importance, it still continues to exist. From Jacob al Baradai the Monophysites of other countries, as well as of those in which he had laboured, derived the name of *Jacobites*.^o

On the death of Timothy, patriarch of Alexandria, in 537, a furious contest for the see arose between the Monophysite parties of Corruptibilists and Incorruptibilists. The government of Justinian supported the Corruptibilist Theodosius, but, after having

ⁱ Gibbon, ii. 432.

^k Walch, viii. 480. Gieseler says that the later date agrees with the result of recent inquiries, I. ii. 376.

^m Gibbon, iv. 385-6; Neand. iii. 161; iv. 271-2; Gieseler, I. ii. 375-6.

ⁿ The date is variously given—541, 545, 551. See Mosh. ii. 56, n.; Walch, viii. 481-491; Schröckh, xviii. 632; Neand. iv. 272; Gieseler, I. ii. 376.

^o Schröckh, xviii. 632-3; Gibbon, iv. 382-3.

given him the victory over his rival, Gaian, set him aside in favour of an orthodox monk named Paul.^p Although, however, the Catholic patriarch obtained possession of the establishment, the monks in general and the mass of the people were Monophysites; and from Egypt the heresy was communicated to the daughter church of Abyssinia. The Catholics of Egypt were styled by their opponents *Melchites* (imperialists);^q and an excited feeling of nationality was enlisted against the council of Chalcedon. In the course of the Alexandrian contests a great part of the city was burnt down, and they were attended by enormous bloodshed. It is said that at the installation of Apollinarius as patriarch, in 551, two hundred thousand persons were slain in one day;—a statement which, although doubtless exaggerated, must have had some frightful truth for its foundation.^r These discords paved the way for the Saracen conquests of the following century.

^p Liberat. 20–3.

^q Gibbon says that this name was unknown till the tenth century (iv. 372);

Pagi, that it is as old as the reign of Marcian, xi. 190.

^r Gibbon, iv. 388.

CHAPTER XIII.

SEMIPELAGIANISM—MISSIONS—DECLINE OF ARIANISM
IN THE WEST.

I. It has been mentioned that the Semipelagian opinions became popular in Gaul, and that Augustine was induced, by Prosper of Aquitaine, and Hilary, to write against them.^a The controversy was kept up with great zeal and activity by Prosper himself, who attacked the "Massilians" not only in treatises of the usual form, but in a poem of a thousand lines,^b and in epigrams. In the year after Augustine's death, Prosper and Hilary went to Rome for the purpose of soliciting Cœlestine to issue a condemnation of Semipelagianism; and, in consequence of this application, the bishop wrote a letter to his Gaulish brethren, in which, while he highly eulogised Augustine, he censured such persons as pursued unprofitable inquiries and introduced novelties of doctrine.^c These expressions, however, were capable of more than one application, and the Semipelagians did not fail to turn them against the advocates of the Augustinian system.^d The abbey of Lerins, founded in the beginning of the fifth century, by Honoratus, afterwards archbishop of Arles,^e was a chief stronghold of Semipelagianism. Vincent, a celebrated monk of that society, was perhaps the author of a direct attack on the doctrines of Augustine;^f it has even been supposed that his "Commonitory," which came to be regarded as the very rule of orthodoxy, was written with a covert intention of proscribing them by its well-known tests of truth—antiquity, universality, and consent.^g

Having failed to effect the suppression of Semipelagianism by

^a Page 429.

^b "Carmen de Ingratis." Prosper's works are in vol. li. of the *Patrologia*.

^c Ep. 21 (*Patrol.* t. 1.).

^d e. g. Vinc. *Lirin. Common.* 32-3 (*Patrol.* 1.); Tillen. xvi. 16; Walch, v. 73-5, 87; Wiggers, ii. 208; Neander, iv. 386.

^e *Hist. Litt.* ii. 37.

^f The 'Objectiones Vincentianæ,' which were answered by Prosper. See Dupin, iv. 172; Schröckh, xviii. 20.

^g See cc. 26, 32; Nat. Alex. x. 116-9; Dupin, iv. 172; Walch, v. 80-1, 147-9;

Schröckh, xviii. 38; Neander, iv. 387; Wiggers, ii. 213. Baronius vehemently contends (431. 188) that the author of the 'Commonitorium' was not the same with the Semipelagian Vincent; but Pagi (in Bar. vii. 472-3) owns the contrary, and salves the memory of Vincent by supposing that he, like Cassian (see below, p. 537), died religiously. Tillemont (xv. 144, 861-2) and the author of the *Hist. Litt.* (ii. 415) will not give a decided opinion, but clearly believe the identity. See n. in Fleury, iii. 170.

authority,^b Prosper continued to combat it vigorously with his pen. Both he and those who followed him on the same sideⁱ were careful to mitigate such parts of the Augustinian system as might seem to be subversive of the obligations to religious living, or inconsistent with the ideas of the Divine love and justice.^k Some of these points he attempted to exempt from discussion by referring them to the "secret things of God."^m God (he said) "has chosen the whole world out of the whole world, and all men are adopted to be His children out of all mankind."ⁿ Every one who is rightly baptised receives forgiveness both of original and of actual sin; if such persons afterwards fall away to unbelief or ungodliness, they are condemned, not for their original sin, but for their own misdeeds—not through an irrespective reprobation, but because God foresaw that they would abuse their free-will.^o Predestination relates to such things only as are of God, and sin is not among these; we must not therefore say that He predestines to sin, but only that He predestines to punishment.^p

Semi-pelagianism still continued to prevail in Gaul. One of its most eminent champions was Faustus, a native of Britain or of Brittany,^q who at the date of Vincent's "Commonitory" was abbot of Lerins, and in 456^r was raised to the bishoprick of Riez. He was famous for strictness of life, and for a power of eloquence which his celebrated contemporary, Sidonius Apollinaris, bishop of Clermont, extols in hyperbolical terms.^s After having vainly endeavoured to convince a presbyter named Lucidus, who held extreme predestinarian opinions,^t Faustus, about the year 475, brought him before a synod held at Arles, where Lucidus was

^b In the book, 'Contra Collatorem,' i. e. against Cassian and his 'Conferences' (xxi. 4), he attempts to stir up Cœlestine's successor, Sixtus III.

ⁱ Among them is remarkable the author of the book, 'De Vocatione Gentium,' printed with Prosper's works, and also in the Append. to Ambrose (Patrol. xvii.), and ascribed to Leo the Great by Quesnel. (Patrol. lv. 399, seqq.) See Wiggers, ii. 218-222; Neander, iv. 391.

^k Dupin, iv. 188.

^m Resp. ad Capitula Gallorum, i. 8.

ⁿ Resp. ad Cap. Gall. ii. 8.

^o Ib. i. 2.

^p Ib. i. 14; Walch, v. 183; Schröckh, xviii. 132-6; Neander, iv. 390-1; Giese-ler, I. ii. 378-9.

^q Avit. Ep. 4 (Patrol. lix. 219). Dupin (iv. 242) and Ampère (ii. 30) incline to follow Ussher in making him a Briton, and the *Histoire Littéraire* speaks de-

cidedly to the same effect (ii. 585). His works are in the *Patrologia*, vol. lviii. On his doctrines, see Wiggers, ii. cc. 12-3.

^r Or 462.

^s Ep. ix. 3, 9 (Patrol. t. lviii.); Tillem. xvi. 409, 414-6.

^t In the time of the Jansenistic controversy, it was disputed whether a distinct sect of *Predestinarians* existed in ancient times. (See Jansen against and Sirmond for its existence, in Patrol. liii. 673; Nat. Alex. ix. Dissert. 5; Tillem. xvi. 19; Dupin, iv. 245-8; Walch, v. 103.) It seems to be now agreed that there was no such sect, although the Augustinian views were no doubt often carried out to extravagance. (Walch, v. 280-4.) The '*Predestinatus*,' a Semi-pelagian treatise of the time, professes to give in its second book the system of an ultra-Augustinian party, which is answered at much greater length in the

obliged to retract many of his doctrines, and to acknowledge that both grace and human exertion are requisite for obedience to the Divine will.^u The synod commissioned Faustus to write a confutation of the errors of Lucidus and his party, and another synod, held at Lyons, requested him to make some additions to the work,^x which thus had an appearance of sanction from the Church of Gaul.^y It opens with a refutation of the grosser tenets of Pelagianism, and then attacks the Augustinian system, which the writer charges with Antinomianism. Faustus, who had been banished by the Arian Euric, in 481, but recovered his see on that prince's death (A.D. 484), died about 491-3, at a very advanced age. His memory was celebrated in his own country as that of a saint;^z but Avitus, bishop of Vienne,^a Cæsarius, bishop of Arles,^b and Claudianus Mamertus, a presbyter of that city, wrote against his opinions;^c and soon after his death his writings were condemned by Gelasius in a decretal epistle, which is memorable as containing the earliest Roman catalogue of forbidden books.^d The treatise of Faustus "On Grace and Free-will," after a time found its way to Constantinople, where it excited much commotion

among the community of Scythian monks. These were already in correspondence with the West on a question which had arisen—"whether One of the Trinity suffered?"^e They applied to Hormisdas, bishop of Rome, for a condemnation of Faustus; and, as his decree^f was not strong enough to satisfy their zeal, their envoys at Rome referred the matter to the ortho-

third book. (Patrol. liii.). Neander (iv. 397-8) strongly argues that this second book is a genuine work of an ultra-Augustinian, not an embodiment of the opinions of such persons by the writer who has inserted it in his work, as is supposed by Wiggers (ii. 340, 348) and Bähr (ii. 375). The form of the book, and the apparent good faith with which the Predestinarian doctrines are laid down, seem to recommend this view.

^u Ep. ad Lucid. (Patrol. liii. 681); Libellus Lucidi, ib. 683. The acts of the Council are lost.

^x "De Gratia Dei et Lib. Arbitrio." Gennadius (himself a Semipelagian) celebrates this work highly. De Script. Eccles. 85.

^y Tillemont (xvi. 424-5) is very anxious to lessen the amount of this sanction, while others have unreasonably denied the story altogether. See Patrol. lviii. 782.

^z In the 'Patrologia' he is styled *Saint*. See the extract from Baronius, Patrol. viii. 778; Tillem. xv. 434-5; Gieseler,

I. ii. 381. The authors of the *Histoire Littéraire* remark that, as the Semipelagian doctrines were not formally condemned before the second council of Orange, it was not until then heretical to hold them. ii. 23; Tillem. xvi. 438; Schröckh, 145.

^a Ep. iv. (Patrol. lix.); Ado, ib. cxxiii. 107.

^b Gennad. 86. It seems, however, probable that the "testimonia" of Cæsarius, there mentioned, were nothing else than the determinations of the Council of Orange (see below). Hist. Litt. iii. 225; Galland, in Patrol. lxvii. 998.

^c Hist. Litt. iii. 344, 597; Walch, v. 112; Schröckh, xviii. 153.

^d Patrol. lix. 164. On the question whether it was specially aimed against the Semipelagianism of Faustus, or against some strange opinions which he held on the materiality of the soul and other subjects, see Walch, v. 112.

^e Patrol. lxiii. 471, seqq.; Baron. 519. 99, seqq. See Petav. de Incarn. v. 2-3. ^f Ep. 70 (Patrol. lxiii.).

dox bishops of Africa who had been banished into Sardinia by the tyranny of the Vandals.^g The most distinguished of these bishops, Fulgentius, of Ruspe,^h took up the question after his recall from exile by Hilderic, and set forth the Augustinian doctrines in a mitigated form, carefully guarding against the possible abuses of them;ⁱ in some respects, however (as with regard to the fate of unbaptized children—even such as die in the womb), he ventured to a rigour beyond his master.^k

Cæsarius, who held the see of Arles from 501 to 542, and was revered for the wisdom and charity which he displayed in the trying circumstances of his age and country,^m procured a condemnation of the Semipelagian tenets by the French bishops in a synod held at Orange in 529.ⁿ In this judgment all that might startle or shock in the predestinarian doctrine was carefully avoided. The opinion of a predestination to sin and condemnation was rejected with abhorrence, and with the expression of a doubt whether it were really entertained by any one; while it was laid down that sufficient grace is bestowed on all the baptized—a doctrine incompatible with the notions of irresistible grace and absolute decrees.^o The decisions of Orange were soon after affirmed by another council at Valence,^p and in the year following they were ratified by Pope Boniface II.^q Thus, in so far as formal condemnation could reach, Semipelagianism was suppressed in the West. But the “Conferences” of its founder maintained their popularity, especially in the monasteries, and the opinions of Cassian were often held where those of Augustine were professed.^r

^g Sup. p. 503. The documents relating to the Scythian monks are in the appendix to Augustine, x. 1771, seqq. See Wiggers, ii. 403, seqq.

^h See p. 504.

ⁱ His works are in Patrol. lxxv. See Pagi, ix. 333; Walch, v. 117–132; Wiggers, ii. 376–393; Neander, iv. 406; Gieseler, I. ii. 380–1.

^k De Fide ad Petrum, 68; Ep. xvii. 58–9; Wiggers, ii. 376–8.

^m See the life of him, Patrol. lxxvii. 100, seqq.; Schröckh, xvii. 408, seqq.; Neander, Memorials, 347–375; Guizot, Civilis. in France, Lect. xvi.; Ampère, ii. 218–231.

ⁿ Conc. Arausiæ. II.; (Patrol. lxxvii. 1144, seqq.)

^o Ib. 1150; Wiggers, ii. 431, 441.

^p Vita Cæsarii, i. 46. The acts are lost.

^q Ep. ad Cæsar. ap. Aug. x. 1790, or Patrol. lxxv. 31.

^r Tillem. xiv. 181; Walch, v. 44, 155–6; Gieseler, I. ii. 128, 379. The reading of the “Conferences” is prescribed in c. 42 of the Benedictine rule. See the next chapter, p. 562. Pagi (vii. 459; comp. ix. 402) states that Cassian, as his opinions had not been condemned during his lifetime, died with the reputation of sanctity; that Gregory the Great styles him *Saint* (Ep. vii. 12); and that his memory continued to be honoured at Marseilles (comp. Wiggers, ii. 17–8). The controversy was, on the whole, carried on with unusual moderation. As the Semipelagians abstained from attacking St. Augustine by name, so their own names were spared by the councils which condemned their opinions.

II. The reigns of Justin the elder and Justinian witnessed the conversion of the Lazi, in Colchis, who thereupon forsook the Persian for the Roman alliance ;^s of the Abasgi, near Mount Caucasus ;^t and of the fierce nation of the Heruli, who had been allowed to cross the Danube in the time of Anastasius.^u The wild tribes about the river Don were also visited by missionaries.^x A powerful impression was made on the nomads of the East by Symeon the Stylite and other ascetics whom they met with in the course of their wandering life ; one Saracen chief was not only converted, but, having exchanged in baptism the name of Aspebethos for that of Peter, was consecrated to exercise a superintendence over his own and other tribes, under the title of "Bishop of the Camps," and sat in the general council of Ephesus.^y

In some quarters the Catholics contended with the new sects in missionary exertion ; but in the remoter regions, the heretics were the more active. The Monophysites, in addition to their gains in countries where orthodox Christianity had already been planted, converted Nubia from heathenism ;^z while the preachers of Nestorianism found out new fields for their labour in the East. In the sixth century the Nestorian school of Nisibis was the only regular institution for the training of clergy. The sectaries, driven from the empire, strengthened the kingdom of Persia by their emigration ; their religious hostility to the Christianity of the emperors secured for them the countenance of the Persian monarchs ; and Nestorianism was established as the only form of Christianity to be tolerated in Persia—thousands of Catholics and Monophysites being slain for refusing to conform to it.^a Persian missionaries penetrated into the heart of Asia,^b and even into China, from which country two of them, in the reign of Justinian, introduced the silkworm into the Greek empire.^c Cosmas, a Nestorian of Egypt—originally a merchant and afterwards a monk, who from his expeditions into the east is known by the name of *Indicopleustes* (the Indian Voyager),—found Christians of his own communion, with bishops and clergy from Persia, in Ceylon, in Malabar, and elsewhere on the Indian coasts. As to Ceylon, however, he expressly states that the natives and their kings were still heathens ; and on the whole it would seem that the Christia-

^s Evagr. iv. 22 ; Gieseler, I. ii. 436.

^t Procop. de Bello Goth. iv. 3.

^u Ib. ii. 14, p. 421 ; Evagr. iv. 30.

^x Evagr. iv. 33.

^y Ib. vi. 22 ; Conc. Ephes. ap. Hard.
i. 1393, 1428.

^z Gieseler, I. ii. 439.

^a Gibbon, iv. 374–6 ; Schröckh, xvi. 297 ; Neand. iii. 260 ; Gieseler, I. ii. 153–4, 437.

^b Cosmas Indicopl. l. iii. p. 179.

^c Proc. de B. Gothico, iv. 17.

nity of those regions extended as yet but little beyond the pale of the Persian commercial settlements.^d

There were religious wars between the Abyssinians and the Homerites, a people of Southern Arabia, who professed the Jewish faith; but the accounts of them are much embarrassed by inconsistencies and other difficulties.^e

III. In the West, the conquests of the Franks extended Christianity wherever they penetrated, and revived that which had been before planted in some districts—as, for example, along the Rhine.^f

The religion of the western converts was too generally tainted both by their own barbarism and by the corruption of the worn-out nations with whose civilization they were brought into contact.^g Much of heathen superstition lingered in combination with Christianity; Gregory of Tours reports it as a popular saying in Spain, that “it is no harm if one who has to pass between heathen altars and God’s church should pay his respects to both.”^h Much vice was tolerated by the clergy, who, although their condition was highly prosperous, did not as yet feel themselves strong enough to check the passions of the powerful.ⁱ The fate of Prætextatus, bishop of Rouen, who, in consequence of having offended the notorious queen Fredegund, was stabbed in his cathedral at high mass on Easter-day,^k was a warning to such of his brethren as might be inclined to take a bolder line. A.D. 586. The depravity of the Frankish princes, in particular, was frightful—perhaps even unparalleled in the records of history;^j and the tone which the bishop of Tours, although himself a good and pious man, employs in speaking of such characters, affords abundant proof that his own ideas were far from any high Christian standard.^m

^d *Topographia Christiana* (in Montfaucon’s *Collectio Nova Patrum*, t. ii. Paris, 1707), l. iii. p. 178; l. xi. p. 337. Cosmas travelled about 522, and published his work about 547. Montf. ii. ii. 110–1. See Gibbon, iii. 376, 508; Hough’s *Christianity in India*, i. 73.

^e *Proc. de B. Pers.* i. 20. See Baron. 522, 523, and Pagi’s notes; Schröckh, xvi. 293–6; xviii. 550; Gieseler, I. ii. 438–9; Neander, iii. 170–1.

^f Schröckh, xvi. 258–260.

^g Gieseler, I. ii. 449–450; Ozanam, *Civ. Chrét. au 5me Siècle*, ii. 73.

^h v. 44. Procopius says that the Franks, although they professed Christianity, practised human sacrifice and

heathen rites of divination. De B. Goth. ii. 25.

ⁱ Sismondi, i. 308.

^k *Greg. Tur.* viii. 31, 41; Thierry, *Récits*, ii. 221, ed. Brux.; Pagi, x. 460. The chronicler of St. Denys says that the queen proceeded “selon la coutume de fame, qui moult plus est de grant engieng à malfaire que n’est homs.” iii. 4 (Bouquet, iii. 214.)

^j Hallam, *Middle Ages*, i. 4, and *Suppl. Notes*, 15, 22; Löbell, 21–33, 99.

^m See Gieseler, I. ii. 452–3; Ampère, ii. 300–4. Gregory was born in 539, and held the see of Tours from 573 to 595.

The evangelical principle of forgiveness for sin was abused to sanction licentiousness and atrocity.ⁿ Fredegund, in instigating two of her servants to assassinate Sigebert, assured them that, if they lived, she would highly honour them, but if they perished in their attempt, she would give largely in alms for them;^o murderers were allowed to take sanctuary in churches, and might not be dragged out without an oath for the safety of their lives.^p Pretended miracles were wrought in vast numbers for the purpose of imposing on the credulous.^q Among the clergy themselves, from the bishops downwards, there was much of vice and even of crime;^r Fredegund, in one of her many murders, found two ecclesiastics to act for hire as the assassins.^s There was a natural tendency to rely on mere rites and outward pomp of worship; yet good men, such as Cæsarius of Arles, were never wanting to assert the necessity of a really living faith and a thoroughly religious practice;^t and throughout all the evils of the time the beneficial effects of the Gospel are to be traced in humane and civilising legislation.^u

IV. During the reign of Justin II., the successor of Justinian, Alboin, king of the Lombards,^x descended on Italy with a host of adventurers collected from many nations and professing a variety of religions—Heathenism, Arianism, and Catholic Christianity.^y The exarch, Narses, who had been affronted by the emperor and superseded in his government, is supposed to have shared in inviting the Lombards,^z and, although he returned to his allegiance, death soon removed him from the path of the invaders.^a Justin was obliged to yield to them the north of Italy and a part of the centre; Pavia became the Lombard capital; and, about twenty years later, the duchy of Beneventum was added to their territories.^b Arianism, which had been extirpated from Italy by the arms of Belisarius and Narses, was again introduced

ⁿ Gieseler, I. ii. 450.

^o *Gesta Regum Francorum*, 32 (*Patrol.* xcvi.).

^p Schröckh, xvi. 255.

^q Gieseler, I. ii. 451–2.

^r Ampère, ii. 286; Perry, 484–5.

^s *Greg. Tur.* viii. 29.

^t Neander, *Mem.* 345, seqq.

^u Schröckh, xvi. 255–8.

^x The proper name of the nation was Winili; but from the length of their beards they were called Langobards (Lombards). Paul. Warnefr. *Hist.*

Langob. i. 9 (*Patrol.* xcvi.).

^y Gibbon, iv. 246–9.

^z P. Warnefr. ii. 9. Mr. Finlay disbelieves the charge, i. 353.

^a P. Warnefr. i. 11.

^b *Ib.* iii. 31; Sismondi, *Rép. Ital.* i. 144. Autharit, the third Lombard king of Italy, introduced the system of dukedoms, which were held under the sovereign, and might be forfeited by misconduct, but otherwise were hereditary. Giannone, iv. 2–3.

by the new conquerors ; and it was among them that it remained latest as a national faith.^c

In Gaul it had given way to the progress of the Frankish power, which everywhere enforced orthodoxy by the sword. Clovis, as we have seen, made a zeal against Arianism the pretext for his invasion of the Visigothic kingdom ;^d and we are told that, when the walls of Angoulême had fallen down before him by miracle, he butchered the Gothic inhabitants for their heresy.^e Sigismund, king of the Burgundians, who had become a convert to the Catholic doctrine before his accession in 517, endeavoured, under the prudent guidance of Avitus, bishop of Vienne, to draw his subjects over after him ; but among the Burgundians, as elsewhere, it was by the victory of the Franks that the heresy was suppressed.^f When the Gothic garrisons were withdrawn A.D. 534. from the north of the Alps to encounter Belisarius in Italy, the Goths ceded Provence to the Franks ; the cession was afterwards confirmed by Justinian, and thus Arianism was expelled from that region.^g

In Spain the Suevi, under Theodoric, returned to the Catholic faith about a century from the time when their forefathers A.D. 559-569. abandoned it.^h

Amalaric, grandson of the great Theodoric, who had succeeded to the Visigothic dominions in Spain, and in Gaul westward of the Rhone,ⁱ married Clotilda, a daughter of Clovis, and endeavoured, by very violent means, to convert her to Arianism.^k Her brother Childebert, roused to indignation by receiving from her a handkerchief stained with her blood, as a proof of the treatment to which she was subjected by her husband, made war on Amalaric, defeated, and killed him. Under the next king of the Visigoths, Theudis, the Catholics enjoyed a free toleration, A.D. 531. with the liberty of holding synods ; and the same policy was followed by his successors, until the latter part of Leovigild's reign.^l On the marriage of Hermenegild, son of this prince, with a daughter of Sigebert, king of the Austrasian Franks, the Gothic queen, Goswintha, who was grandmother to the young princess^m

^c Gibbon, iv. 259-261 ; Schröckh, xviii. 129-130 ; Gieseler, I. ii. 441.

^d P. 498.

^e Hincmar, Vita Remigii, 52 (Patrol. cxxv.); Revillout, 168.

^f Schröckh, xviii. 121 ; Neand. v. 6 ; Revillout, 199-217.

^g Procop. de B. Goth. iii. 33.

^h Isid. Hispal. de Regibus Goth. 91 (Patrol. lxxxiii. 1082) ; Mariana, ii. 98.

ⁱ Greg. Tur. iii. 10.

^k M. Henri Martin remarks that the Gothic princesses, who were married to Catholics, readily gave up their Arianism ; whereas the Frank princesses, who married Arians, earnestly adhered to the Catholic faith. ii. 63.

^l Schröckh, xviii. 76 ; Revillout, 177.

^m By her former marriage, with Athanagild, Goswintha was mother of

as well as stepmother to her husband, exercised great cruelty towards her in the attempt to seduce her from the orthodox faith. Hermenegild was banished from the court, and was soon after induced, by the persuasions of his wife, and of Leander, bishop of Seville, to become a Catholic—a step which offended Leovigild, not only on religious grounds, but because there was room for apprehending political danger from the connexion into which the prince was thus brought with the Catholic portion of his father's subjects. Hermenegild was consequently deprived of his share in the government. Supported by foreign princes of his new communion, he rebelled against his father; but the rebellion was suppressed, and Hermenegild, as he firmly refused to return A.D. 577–585. to Arianism, and gave Leovigild reason to apprehend a renewal of his insurrection, was put to death.ⁿ Leovigild had been provoked by his son's conduct to exercise severities against the Catholics. One of their bishops had apostatised and had submitted to rebaptism; but the king, wishing to facilitate conversion to his heresy, had prevailed on an Arian council to recognise the baptism of the Church.^o After the death of Hermenegild, he subdued the Suevi and united their kingdom to his own; and both in the old and in the new portions of his dominions the Catholics were under persecution until his death in 586.^p His son, Recared, who then succeeded to the throne, avowed himself a Catholic—the persuasives to his change of belief being, as in many other cases of this age, partly of a miraculous kind. Conspiracies were set on foot against him by the widowed queen Goswintha, and others of the Arian party; but he succeeded in suppressing them; and a synod of seventy bishops, held at Toledo in 589, established the Catholic faith among his people.^q Thus, at the end of the period embraced in this volume, the Lombards were the only nation who continued to adhere to Arianism.

V. While the British Church was pent up in the mountains, and Saxon heathenism overspread the rest of the land, the Church of Ireland was in a very flourishing condition.^r Columba,^s an Irish

Sigebert's queen, the famous Brunichild.

ⁿ Maximus Caesaraug. Patrol. lxxx. 628–9; Greg. Tur. v. 39; vi. 43; Mariana, iv. 118–131; Gibbon, iii. 374–6; Revillout, 235–9, 245.

^o Isid. Hisp. de Regg. Goth. 50.

^p Mariana, iv. 134–8; Pagi, x. 405; Revillout, 244. Maximus of Saragossa

says that Leovigild, on his deathbed, repented, and embraced the Catholic faith. Patrol. lxxx. 629.

^q Hard. iii. 472; Baron. 589. 9–45; Gibbon, iii. 376–7; Lembke, i. 78–87; Revillout, 250–4.

^r Gieseler, I. ii. 457–8; Neand. v. 12.

^s The Life of Columba, written about a century after his time, by Adamnan,

abbot of royal descent,^t after having founded monasteries in the north of Ireland,^u passed into Scotland with twelve companions^x in the year 563,^y—in expiation (according to Irish tradition) of the part which he had taken in the sanguinary feuds of his countrymen.^z It has been supposed that he was invited by Conall, king of the Dalriads, who was his kinsman;^a and, in addition to gaining an influence over that prince and his family, he converted Brud, king of the northern Picts, whom he visited in his castle near Inverness.^b For thirty-four years Columba laboured as a missionary, both on the mainland and in the Hebrides^c—his chief residence being in the island of Hy (afterwards called from him Icolumbkille^d or Iona),^e where he established a monastery which was long famous as a seat of religion and learning, and became the nursery of clergy whose labours extended not only over Scotland, but far into the southern division of the island. The abbots of Hy were at the head of a great society which had its monasteries both in Scotland and in Ireland;^f and, out of respect for the memory of the founder, who had himself been only a presbyter, even the bishops of the district, by what Bede terms an “unusual arrangement,”^g were in some respects subject to them.

ninth abbot of Hy, may be found in Canisius, and in vol. lxxxviii. of the *Patrologia*; but the best text is that published by the Rev. W. Reeves, D.D., for the Irish Archaeological Society (Dublin, 1857); and the editor has illustrated with a profusion of learning, both his immediate subject and the general history of the early Irish and Scottish Churches. Adamnan was unfortunately less anxious to give historical information than to set forth the miracles, prophecies, and visions by which the memory of his hero was distinguished.

^t Adamn. Præf. p. 8; King, i. 75.

^u See Reeves, lxxiii. 162, 276.

^x Adamn. iii. 4. For the recurrence of the number twelve in such cases, see Reeves, 299, seqq.

^y Lanigan, ii. 158; Reeves, lxxv. 9. Bede places the date two years later, iii. 4.

^z See Reeves, lxxiv. 247, seqq.

^a Ib. lxxv.

^b Adamn. ii. 33, 35; Beda, iii. 4.

^c Lanigan, ii. 161, seqq. For the traces of his foundations, see Reeves, 136, 289.

^d The name of Columbkille, i.e. Columba of the Church, was given to him in early life, from the diligence with which he frequented the services of the

church (Reeves, lxx.), and came into general use between his own time and that of Bede. Bede, v. 9; Lanigan, ii. 115.

^e The word in the best MSS., not only of Adamnan, but of other early writers, is *Ioua*, which Adamnan uses as an adjective, agreeing with *insula*, the root of it being *Iou*. From a misreading of this, and a fanciful connexion with the Hebrew equivalent of the saint's name (as to which Adamnan remarks that it was the same with the Hebrew *Iona*, with the Greek *πισισπά*, and with the name of the prophet Jonah—Præf. 2, p. 4), *Ioua* was changed into the better-known form *Iona*. (Reeves, 258–262.) For other derivations which have been proposed, see Lanigan, ii. 153; Reeves, 413.

^f The system is very carefully collected from Adamnan and other authorities by Dr. Reeves, 339, seqq.

^g “Ordine inusitato” (Bed. iii. 4). From this Presbyterian writers have eagerly inferred that the early Scottish Church differed in its polity from the rest of the Christian world; and they have sought to convert Iona into a precedent for their own system. For a refutation of their arguments, see Collier, i. 142–3; Skinner, i. 97, seqq.; Lanigan, i. 254–6; Lingard, A. S. C. i. 154; Rus-

The death of Columba has been variously dated, but appears to have taken place in 597, at the age of seventy-six.^h

The British Churches, in consequence of their remoteness and of the want of communication with Rome, retained some peculiarities which afterwards became subjects of controversy.ⁱ Among these was the time of observing Easter. Although, like the Quartodecimans of Asia, the Britons professed to derive their practice from St. John, they were not Quartodecimans, inasmuch as they always celebrated the festival on a Sunday.^k It would seem, in truth, that their difference from the Roman usage in this respect arose from adherence to the earlier cycle of the Roman Church itself, which had in the mean time been superseded by other and more accurate calculations.^l

sell, i. 15-44. It appears evident, without the necessity of argument, that, if the bishops existed at all—which is a part of Bede's statement—the "unusual arrangement" by which they were subjected to the abbots of Hy, must have related, not to the strictly spiritual part of their functions, but to some matters of jurisdiction and regulation which did not touch the essence of the episcopate. Columba's own reverence for the episcopal order appears very strongly from an anecdote in Adamnan, i. 44. See Dr. Reeves' note there; also pp. 69, 340-1.

^h Reeves, lxxviii. 309, seqq. Adamnan's account of the death is touching, and one incident may be here quoted from it. The abbot goes forth with a disciple to survey for the last time the precincts of his monastery; and having visited the barn, sits down.—"Dumque ibidem Sanctus, senio fessus, paululum sedens, requiesceret, ecce albus occurrit caballus, obediens servitor, qui scilicet lactaria bocetum [*i.e.* bovine] inter et monasterium vascula gestare consueverat. Hic ad Sanctum accedens, mirum dictu, caput in sinu ejus ponit, ut credo inspirante Deo, cui omne animal rerum sapit sensu quo jusserit ipse Creator, dominum a se suum mox emigraturum, et ipsum ultra non visurum sciens, cœpit plangere, ubertimque, quasi homo, lacrymas in gremium Sancti fundere, et valde spumans flere. Quod

videns minister, cœpit illum flebilem repellere lamentatorem: sed Sanctus prohibuit eum, dicens, 'Sine hunc, sine nostri amatorem, ut in hunc meum sinum fletus effundat amarissimi planctus. Ecce tu, homo cum sis, et rationalem animam habeas, nullo modo scire de meo exitu potuisti, nisi quod tibi ego ipse nuper manifestavi; huic vero bruto et irrationabili animanti, quoquo modo ipse Conditor voluit, egressurum a se Dominum manifeste revelavit.' Et hæc dicens mœstum a se revertentem equum benedixit ministratorem." iii. 23, pp. 231-2.

ⁱ Gieseler, I. ii. 458-9.

^k Bede, iii. 4; Nat. Alex. v. Dissert. 5, art. 8; iii. 17; Johnson's Canons, i. 90; Goodall in Keith's Catal. of Scottish Bishops, xlix.-lii. ed. Russell, Edinb. 1824; Smith in Bede, Patrol. xcv. 318, 324-6; Lingard, A. S. C. i. 51; Russell, i. 48-50, and n. on Spottiswoode, i. 49-50; Reeves' Adamnan, 26. It is on a mistaken notion of their having been Quartodecimans that the idea of referring the British Churches to a directly Eastern origin chiefly rests. Gieseler, I. ii. 460.

^l Those of Victorinus of Aquitaine, A.D. 457, and of Dionysius Exiguus, A.D. 525. Gieseler, I. ii. 459; Skinner, i. 110-4. See note in Fleury, iii. 326-330; Hoffmann, Hist. Cycl. Dionys. in Patrol. lxxvii. 468.

CHAPTER XIV.

SUPPLEMENTARY.

I. *The Patriarchal Sees.—Relations with the State.*

DURING the period between the Council of Chalcedon and the end of the sixth century, the influence of Alexandria and of Antioch declined. Such was the natural result of the differences by which the Churches were distracted—with the frequent and bloody conflicts of their factions—the forcible expulsions and installations of bishops, who, instead of being shepherds over the whole community, could only be the chiefs of parties—and the variations of doctrine and policy between the successive occupants of the sees.^a In the meanwhile, Constantinople was advancing in authority and importance. The Council of Chalcedon had conferred on it a right of receiving appeals from bishops or clerks against their metropolitans.^b By the help of Zeno, the patriarchs of Constantinople finally reduced the exarchate of Ephesus to subjection; and the deprivations at Alexandria and Antioch gave them repeated opportunities of exercising an apparent superiority over those elder churches, by consecrating patriarchs for them and otherwise interfering in their concerns.^c The argument for the precedence of Rome, in so far as it was founded on the dignity of the ancient capital—(the only foundation of it which the East had ever acknowledged)—fell with the Western Empire. It has been supposed that Acacius conceived the idea of raising his see above Rome;^d and it seems at least probable that Constantinople might have successfully rivalled the power of the great Western Church, had not its bishops been placed at a disadvantage in consequence of their dependence on the court, and weakened by their quarrels with the emperors.

The bishops of Rome, as before, pursued in the main a steady course. They were still on the orthodox and victorious side in the controversies of the time; and thus their reputation and influ-

^a Gieseler, I. ii. 396. ^b Can. 9, 17. ^d Schröckh, xvii. 178, after Baron.

^c Schröckh, xvii. 41-2; Wiltsh, i. 472-5.
143.

ence grew. They were invoked and courted by the various parties in the Eastern disputes; the emperors themselves found their account in paying court to the bishops of Rome, and using them as a check on the patriarchs of Constantinople.^e The wealth of the Roman see was increased by the acquisition of great estates, not only in Italy, but in Gaul, Spain, Africa, and even in Asia. And hence, in addition to gaining the natural influence of wealth, the bishops were able, by means of the agents employed in the management of their lands, to keep a watchful eye on the ecclesiastical affairs of distant provinces, and to exercise a frequent interference in them.^f Even the heresy of the barbarians who overran the West was in its effect favourable to the power of the Roman see, inasmuch as, by everywhere presenting the same enemy, it tended to force the Catholics into combination and centralization, and prevented the breaking up of the Church into separate nationalities.^g

In Italy, the title of *Pope* was now usually appropriated to the bishop of Rome,^h although in other countries of the West it continued to be bestowed on bishops in general until the time of Gregory VII. In Eastern usage, it was commonly restricted to the bishops of Rome and Alexandria.ⁱ Titles of more imposing sound, such as that of *Ecumenical Bishop*, were sometimes applied to the bishops of Rome,—chiefly by persons whose interest it was to flatter them; the first instance of this kind was at the Council of Chalcedon, where the Alexandrian complainants against Dioscorus, wishing to enlist the Roman legates in their cause, styled Leo “Ecumenical Archbishop, and Patriarch of the great Rome.”^k But such titles—originating among orientals, and in the inflation of oriental language—were not intended to be understood in that exclusive sense which the words might naturally convey to our minds. Thus the style of “Ecumenical Patriarch” was assumed by the bishops of Constantinople, who yet made no pretensions to dominion over the Western Church.^l And it was not supposed that there was any incompatibility between the titles, when, at the council under Mennas, in 536, the bishops of Rome and Constantinople were

^e Schröckh, xviii. 477; Planck, i. 652, 669, 670; Gieseler, I. ii. 400.

^f Planck, i. 629–632.

^g Revillout, 394.

^h Ennodius of Pavia, about A.D. 500, appears to have been the first writer who thus restricted the title. See n. in Patrol. lxiii. 69.

ⁱ Schröckh, xvii. 23–5; Gieseler, I. ii. 228, 405.

^k Labb. et Coss. iv. 395. It was afterwards pretended that the title was given by the whole council (Greg. M. Epp. V. 18, 20, 44); but Gregory's editors show that this was not the case.

^l Bingham, II. xvii. 21. The Constantinopolitan use of the title arose from the restricted sense of the word *οικουμενική* (Schröckh, xvii. 55, 76). See vol. ii. chap. 1.

each styled "Archbishop and Ecumenical Patriarch;"^m or when Justinian addressed each of them as "Head of all the Churches."ⁿ

The Roman bishops extended their claims of jurisdiction^o—sometimes resting them on canons and imperial edicts, but more frequently on privileges alleged to be derived from St. Peter—with whom, however, St. Paul, the companion of his martyrdom, and Apostle of the Gentiles, was still joined as having contributed to the foundation of the claim.^p

In the West, disputes which arose between bishops as to precedence and jurisdiction occasioned a frequent recourse to Rome, and advanced the idea of a supreme jurisdiction in that see—the more so, because the contending parties were often subjects of different governments.^q A like effect followed from the applications which churches became accustomed to make to Rome for advice in cases of difficulty. These drew forth decretal epistles by way of answer; the applicants were glad to be assured that the substance of such replies was of apostolical tradition and of universal authority; and the pope came to be regarded as a general dictator in matters of this kind.^r About the middle of the sixth century, Dionysius Exiguus, a Roman monk of Scythian birth, collected the canons of the general and of the chief provincial councils, translating those which were in Greek, and including with them the decretal epistles of the Roman bishops, from Siricius downwards. The work became a standard of ecclesiastical law in the West; and it contributed largely to heighten the authority of the see whose decisions and advices were thus apparently placed on a level with the decrees of councils.^s

Although, however, the Roman bishops not only became the highest judges of ecclesiastical matters in the West, but also claimed a right of watching over the faith of the whole Church,

^m Labb. et Coss. v. 21, 46.

ⁿ In Cod. I. ii. 24, he says "Constantinopolitana ecclesia omnium ecclesiarum est caput." See Planck, i. 653–4; Schröckh, xvii. 42.

^o Pelagius II. is said to have been the first pope who claimed the right of summoning general councils, A.D. 587 (Ep. 6; Planck, i. 681). But the epistle belongs to the great forgery of the Decretals. Patrol. lxxii. 738; Jaffé, 936.

^p "Cui data est etiam societas Beati Pauli." (Gelas. Decr. de libris recipiendis, Patrol. lix. 167). "Saulus, ad Christum conversus, caput effectus est nationum, quia obtinuit totius ecclesiæ principatum." (Greg. M. in Lib. I. Regum,

iv. 28, ib. lxxix.). Fulgentius still interprets the promise to St. Peter (Matth. xvii.) as belonging to the whole church. De Remiss. Pecc. i. 19; ii. 20 (ib. lxx.). See Schröckh, xvii. 183–4; Planck, i. 663–5; Gieseler, I. ii. 401–2.

^q Guizot, ii. 48–9.

^r Schröckh, xvii. 17; Planck, i. 658–660; Guizot, i. 329.

^s Dupin, v. 62; Schröckh, xvii. 379–386; Planck, i. 701–2; Walter, 164. Dionysius is also memorable as the inventor of the paschal cycle mentioned p. 544; and as the author of dating from the Christian era. Pagi, ix. 383; Sirmond. in Patrol. lxxvii. 137.

the idea of a proper supremacy, such as that which was asserted in later times, was as yet unknown.^t The bishops of Rome still admitted those of the other great "apostolical" churches—Alexandria and Antioch—to be of the same grade with themselves.^u They did not pretend to be of a superior order to other bishops; nor did they claim a right of interfering with any diocese, except in case of the bishop's misconduct.^x

The relations of the Roman bishops with the civil power varied according to the political changes of the times. At the election of a successor to Simplicius, in the year 483, Basil, an officer of Odoacer, appeared, and, professing to act in accordance with advice given by the late pope to his master, expressed the king's surprise that such a matter had been undertaken without obtaining the royal license; he also proposed a regulation that no bishop of Rome should alienate any property belonging to the see, on pain of excommunication for himself and the purchaser.^y The result is not recorded; but there can hardly be a doubt that the barbarian king's emissary had an important influence on the choice of the new bishop.^z

Theodoric, in the earlier part of his reign, allowed the Church a great liberty of self-regulation—considering that the schism which divided Rome from Constantinople secured him against any danger from correspondence between the clergy of his own dominions and their eastern brethren.^a On the death of Anastasius II., in 498, a violent contest for the pontificate took place between Symmachus and Laurence. The Arian king did not interfere until the matter was brought before him at Ravenna by the parties;^b when he decided that the see should belong to that bishop who had been first consecrated and had the larger number of adherents;^c and Symmachus was consequently established. In 502, this bishop held a synod, by which the interference of Basil at the election after the death of Simplicius was indignantly reprobated as an unwarrantable encroachment on the part of the laity.^d Theodoric allowed the censure to pass without notice—being, probably, not unwilling to permit an attack on the memory of his rival, even at the expense of failing to assert the claims of the

^t Planck, i. 665-7; Gieseler, I. ii. xvii, 179-181. 401.

^u Gieseler, I. ii. 405.

^x Planck, i. 668; Gieseler, I. ii. 405-6.

^y The authority for this is the Synod of 502. Patrol. lxii. 74-5.

^z See Tillem. xvi. 338; Schröckh,

^a Gieseler, I. ii. 398.

^b "Id quidem," says Baronius, "suasit impulitque importuna et malesuada necessitas, legum inscia." 498. 4-5.

^c Anastas. 123.

^d Patrol. lxii. 72-80.

crown.^e In the following year, at the request of the partisans of Laurence, who had again made head, Theodoric appointed the bishop of Altino *visitor* of the Roman Church. The commissioner behaved (it is said) in an arbitrary and grossly partial manner, so as greatly to irritate the adherents of Symmachus. For the investigation of some serious charges which had been brought against Symmachus, Theodoric summoned a council of bishops from all parts of Italy, which, from the place of its meeting, is known as the Synod of the Palm;^f and this assembly, A.D. 503. after severely censuring the late appointment of a visitor as an unwarranted novelty, pronounced Symmachus innocent, in so far as man's decision was concerned, and declared that, on account of certain specified difficulties, the case was left to the Divine judgment alone.^g The proposition which has been erroneously inferred from this as the opinion of the council, that the pope was *exempt* from all earthly judgment—was soon after maintained by Ennodius, bishop of Ticinum (Pavia), a partisan of Symmachus;^h and for the confirmation of the new pretension, acts of earlier popes were forged in a strain utterly contradictory of genuine older documents, such as the letters of the Roman clergy in the time of Gratian.ⁱ

On the renewal of intercourse between Rome and Constantinople, Theodoric, as we have seen, began to watch the Church with a jealousy very opposite to the spirit of his earlier system. The mission of pope John to Constantinople, with its consequences, has been related in a former chapter.^k Theodoric, in the month before his own death, nominated the successor of John, Felix IV., and during the remaining time of the Gothic rule in Italy, the kings controlled the election of the popes.^l

Justinian, in his eastern dominions, aimed at reducing the bishops to a greater dependence on the court; and, as this policy was accompanied by professions of great reverence for them, with an increase of their dignities and privileges in some respects, the Greeks submitted to it without reluctance.^m The emperor not only

^e Schröckh, xvii. 180, 209; Gieseler, I. ii. 398-400.

^f This name seems to have designated a hall of the palace. See Muratori, Annali, iii. 280, 289. As to the date, see Pagi and Mansi in Baron. ix. 12.

^g Hard. ii. 967-970.

^h Opusc. 2, Patrol. lxxiii. 200. He says that the chair of St. Peter had ■ sanctifying power. Ib. 188.

ⁱ (A.D. 378.) See above, p. 305;

Baron. 500. 7; Gieseler, I. ii. 402-4. Symmachus introduced the custom of giving the *pall*, which will be more fully noticed in a later stage of the history. See, e. g. his 12th epistle (Patrol. lxii.); Hussey, 134.

^k P. 519.

^l Cassiodor. Variarum, viii. 15; Baron. 526. 22; Mosh. ii. 19; Gibbon, iii. 471; Gieseler, I. ii. 407-8.

^m Gieseler, I. ii. 395.

interfered much in regulations as to matters of discipline, even the most important, but carried out largely the example first set by Basiliscus,ⁿ of determining points of faith by edicts.^o His mandates in ecclesiastical matters were published by the agency of patriarchs, metropolitans, and bishops, in like manner as his edicts on secular subjects were issued through the various grades of lay officials.^p

A.D. 541. He attempted, without the sanction of a general council, to erect a sixth patriarchate, by bestowing on the bishop of his native place, Justiniana Prima or Lychnidus (Achrida), in Illyricum, a wide jurisdiction, with privileges which were intended to be modelled on those of Rome.^q But the attempt proved abortive; the new patriarchs never obtained effectual recognition, and, soon after the death of Justinian, the bishops of Lychnidus are found among the suffragans of Rome.^r

On the conquest of Italy, Justinian began to deal with the bishops of Rome as he had dealt with those of Constantinople. He addressed them in flattering titles, and aimed at reducing them to the condition of tools.^s He made new and stringent regulations as to the confirmation of the pope by the civil power. According to the "*Liber Diurnus*," a collection of forms which represents the state of things in those days, or shortly after,^t the death of a Roman bishop was to be notified to the Exarch of Ravenna; the successor was to be chosen by the clergy, the nobles of Rome, the soldiery, and the citizens; and the ratification of the election was to be requested in very submissive terms, both of the emperor and of his deputy the exarch.^u The share which the laity had from early times enjoyed in the choice of bishops generally, was restricted by a law of Justinian, which ordered that the election should be made by the clergy and principal inhabitants of each city,^x to the exclusion of the great mass of the people, whose disorders had too often afforded a pretext for the change.

The proceedings of Vigilius in the controversy as to the Three Articles—the humiliations which he endured—his vacillations, so

ⁿ P. 507.

^o See Dupin, v. 55, seqq.; Schröckh, xvi. 27; xvii. 473; Gieseler, I. ii. 396; Milman, Lat. Christ. i. 355, seqq.

^p Bingham, II. xvii. 18; Gieseler, I. ii. 395.

^q Novell. xi.; cxxxi. 3.

^r Greg. M. Ep. ii. 23; De Marca, II. ix. 1; Pagi, x. 151-2; Schröckh, xvii. 45; Wiltsch, i. 119-122.

^s Schröckh, xvii. 475; Gieseler, I. ii. 408.

^t The editor, Garnier, refers it to the

papacy of Gregory II., A.D. 714 (Patrol. cv. 13); but the system which it exhibits is older. See Pagi, xii. 381; Schröckh, xvii. 233-6.

^u Lib. Diurn. ii. 1-4 (Patrol. cv.).

^x "*Clerici et primores civitatis*" (Novell. cxxxvii. 2, A.D. 541). One commentator asserts, against Godefroy and common sense, that by "*primores*" are not meant "*primores plebis*," but the chief ecclesiastics, such as archdeacons and archpresbyters.

utterly contradictory of the later Roman pretensions—tended to lower the dignity and reputation of his see; and it was greatly weakened by the schism of Aquileia and other provinces.^y But, on the other hand, the Lombard invasion, in 568, had the effect of increasing the political power of the popes, as they were obliged, in virtue of their extensive property, to take a prominent part in the measures adopted for self-defence by the inhabitants of such portions of Italy as still belonged to the empire; while their services were requited by the emperors with the power of appointing to many offices, and with other civil privileges.^z

II. *Condition of the Clergy.*

(1.) In the course of the fifth and sixth centuries, a growing opinion as to the obligation of celibacy on the clergy had the effect of separating them more and more widely from other Christians. No General Council ventured to prohibit the marriage of the clergy; that of Chalcedon assumes the existence of prohibitions, but does not itself lay down any such law with a view of binding the whole Church.^a But local councils were continually occupied with the subject, and the bishops of Rome were steady in advancing the cause of celibacy.^b The general aim of the canons was to prevent marriage altogether, if possible; to extend the prohibition to the inferior grades of the ministry; to debar the married from higher promotion; to prevent such clerks as were allowed to marry once from entering into a second union; to limit their choice to women who had never been married; to separate the married clergy from their wives, or, if they lived together, to restrain them from conjugal intercourse.^c These regulations belong chiefly to the Western Church—a greater liberty being apparently allowed in the East.^d But, as has been remarked in a former period,^e the frequency of canons is itself a proof how imperfectly they were able to make way; and very many cases are recorded which show that the enforcement of them

^y Walch, viii. 325, seqq.; Gieseler, I. ii. 409–410.

^z Planck, ii. 667; Gieseler, I. ii. 410–2.

^a See Can. 14; Schröckh, xvi. 378–9.

^b Schröckh, viii. 25–6; xvi. 389.

^c The widows of the higher clergy were forbidden to marry, on pain of exclusion from communion until on their death-bed (Conc. Tolet. I. A.D. 400, Can. 18). Theiner (i. 341, 343) inter-

prets some other canons as ordering that they should not communicate even when dying; but the word used in those canons, *relicta*, evidently means a wife whom her husband has *forsaken* on a religious ground. See Conc. Eliber. cc. 8–9 (Hard. i. 951); Greg. M. Epp. iv. 36; xi. 50.

^d See Soc. v. 22; Planck, i. 352; Theiner, i. 330, seqq.

^e P. 312.

was found impracticable, and that a variety of usages in different places was largely tolerated.^f Thus Lupus, bishop of Troyes, and Euphronius of Autun, while mentioning the restraints which they placed on the marriage of ostiaries, exorcists, and subdeacons, are obliged to content themselves with saying that, as to the higher grades, to which the canons forbade marriage, they endeavoured to avoid raising to them persons engaged in that state, or to enforce separation between the married clergy and their wives.^g And a witness of a more unfavourable kind to the resistance which such laws met with, is found in the fact that, in proportion as celibacy was enforced on the clergy, it became the more necessary to enact canons prohibiting them to entertain concubines or other "extraneous" female companions.^h

The marriage of the clergy is now the subject not only of canons, but of imperial laws. Honorius, in 420—perhaps at the suggestion of Boniface, bishop of Rome—enacted, in accordance with the Nicene canon, that the clergy should not have as inmates of their houses any women except their own nearest relatives; but it was allowed that such of the clergy as had married before ordination should retain their wives; "for," it was said, "those are not unfitly joined to clerks who have, by their conversation, made their husbands worthy of the priesthood."ⁱ A century later, Justinian, by several enactments, forbade the promotion of persons who had children or grandchildren to bishopricks, on the ground that such connexions were a temptation to prefer the interests of kindred to those of the church; he confirmed all the ecclesiastical prohibitions of clerical marriage, and declared the issue of such marriages illegitimate, and incapable of inheriting property.^k

(2.) The privileges of the clergy in general were on the in-

^f Schröckh, xvi. 385-7; Planck, i. 353; ii. 84-6; Theiner, i. 263.

^g Lup. Ep. 2 (Patrol. lviii.).

^h Schröckh, xvi. 387-9; Theiner, i. 335, 339, 341, 343, 353, 390, 395, &c. The council of Toledo in 589 ordered that priests and deacons who had been converted from Arianism should renounce the conjugal intercourse which their heretical communion had allowed, or, if they persisted in living "obscenely" with their wives, should be reduced to the order of readers; and that, if any of the clergy who had always been under the discipline of the church should be found to entertain suspicious women in their dwellings, the women

should be sold by the bishops, and the price should be given to the poor (Conc. Tolet. III. c. 5). In the following year a council at Seville states that some bishops had neglected to enforce this canon, and orders that the judges should, with the bishop's permission, seize the "extraneas fœminas vel ancillas" for their own profit, swearing to the bishops that they would not restore them to their clerical friends. Conc. Hispal. I. c. 3 (Patrol. lxxxiv.).

ⁱ Cod. Theod. xvi. 11. 44; Theiner, i. 261; comp. Just. Novell. cxxiii. 29.

^k Cod. Just. I. iii. 42, 45, 48; Novell. vi. 2; cxxiii. 12-14; cxxxvii. 1.

crease.¹ Their immunities were confirmed and enlarged; the tendency of legislation was to encourage the bestowal of riches on the Church, and to secure to it the permanent possession of all that had been acquired.^m The idea of expiating sin by money, and especially by liberality to the Church, was now put forth more broadly than before;ⁿ and it found the readier entrance among the Teutonic tribes from the circumstance that the system of compensating for crimes by fines had prevailed among them before their conversion.^o Laws and canons were often found necessary to check the practice of obtaining ordination or spiritual dignities by money.^p

While the judgment of ecclesiastical matters belonged exclusively to the spiritual courts,^q the bishops had cognizance also of secular causes in which the clergy were concerned, although in these causes the parties were at liberty either to resort, in the first instance, to a secular tribunal, or to appeal from the bishop to the lay judge, whose sentence, if contrary to that of the bishop, might become the subject of a further appeal.^r

In criminal cases, the clergy were exempted from the jurisdiction of lay tribunals for slight offences, although it seems to be doubtful how far this exemption practically extended.^s Honorius, in 407, at the request of African councils, appointed lay "Defenders" (*defensores*) of the Church, whose business it was to watch over its privileges and to maintain its rights, so that the clergy should not be obliged to be personally present in secular courts.^t Justinian enacted that bishops should not be required to appear in courts as witnesses; certain officers were appointed to

¹ Schröckh, xvi. 337.

^m *E.g.* Cod. Just. I. ii. 1. 14; Novell. vii.; Bingham, V. ii.; iv. 6, 9; Baron. 455. 25-8; Schröckh, viii. 15; xvi. 400-4, 409; Planck, i. 288.

ⁿ As by Salvian, in his four books "Adversus Avaritiam," Patrol. liii. *E.g.*, "*Peccata tua, inquit, in elemosynis redime* (Dan. iv. 24). *Quid est aliqua redimere?* opinor, pretium rerum quæ redimuntur dare . . . Æstima diligentissime culpas quas admisisti. Vide quid pro mendaciis debeas, quid pro maledictis atque perjuriis, &c. Cumque omnium suppultaveris numerum, expende pretia singulorum" (i. 12). In a letter relating to these books, he says that gifts and charities are the easiest way of redeeming sins—easier than the endurance of penitential discipline (*exomologesi et satisfactione*); and that to give money to God is greater and more excellent than

to bestow it on the poor or on churches (Ep. 9),—where by giving "to God" he seems to mean religious endowments. Schröckh, however, appears to me to treat Salvian with great injustice as to this. xvi. 419, seqq.

^o Schröckh, xvi. 426-7; Schmidt, i. 351; Gieseler, I. ii. 450.

^p *E.g.* Glycerius ap. Leon. M. iii. 896; Cod. Just. I. iii. 33; Novell. cxix. 16; Schröckh, xvi. 326-7; xvii. 217, 220.

^q Cod. Just. I. iv. 29.

^r *Ib.* 4; Novell. cxix. 21.

^s See Planck, i. 304-7. The Council of Mâcon, A.D. 581, lays down that secular judges are not to meddle with them "*absque causâ criminali, i. e. homicidio, furto, aut maleficio.*" c. 7.

^t Conc. Carth., A.D. 400, c. 9; Cod. Just. I. iii. 53. 4. See Thomassin, I. ii. 9.

wait on them for the purpose of taking their depositions, which were not to be made on oath, but on their mere word, with the Gospels lying before them.^u The bishops were charged with an oversight of prisoners, lunatics, minors, foundlings, and other helpless persons, and were furnished with the powers necessary for the exercise of it.^x They were also charged with a general supervision of public morals—thus, for example, it was their duty to check the practice of gaming.^y They were, in conjunction with the civil magistrates, to manage the appointment of the subordinate officers of government, and were, with the principal inhabitants of each city, to superintend public works, buildings, and establishments, as also the administration of the local revenues.^z They were to see that the civil governors and judges did their duty, while the governors in turn were to take care that the bishops should hold synods regularly, and should not alienate the property of the Church;^a but, whereas the prefect was not authorised to do more than admonish a bishop of his neglect, and, in case of his persevering in it, to report the matter to the emperor, the bishop had, in some circumstances, a right to supersede the prefect in his functions.^b The consequence of such regulations was, that the bishops advanced in political influence, and became more entangled in secular business; and that, agreeably to the object of Justinian's policy, they were reduced into a greater dependence on the court by becoming officers of the state.^c

(3.) The patronage of the churches in every diocese originally belonged to the bishop.^d The earliest exception to this rule was made by the first Council of Orange, in 441, which enacted that where a bishop, for some special reason, had built a church within the diocese of another, he should, in consideration of his bounty, be allowed to appoint the incumbent.^e This privilege was extended to the laity in general, by a law of Justinian, which A.D. 541. enacted that any one who should found a church, and should endow it with a maintenance for a clerk, might nominate a person, who should be ordained to it. The bishops, however, were at liberty in such cases to refuse ordination, if the individual presented were unfit.^f

^u Novell. cxxiii. 7.

^x Cod. Just. I. iv. 22, 24, 27, 28, 30, 33.

^y Ib. 25, 34; III. xliii. 1, 3.

^z Cod. Just. I. iv. 17, 26; Novell. cxxviii. 16.

^a Novell. vii.; Epilog. cxxxvii. 6.

^b Novell. lxxxvi.

^c Schröckh, xvi. 325, 339-342.

^d Thomassin, II. i. 33-4.

^e Can. 10; Thomassin, II. i. 29; Walter, 488.

^f Novell. cxxiii. 18.

(4.) The power of the clergy in the West survived the system under which it had grown up. During the barbarian invasions, they often stood forward, and with effect, to intercede for their flocks.^g The conquerors found them established as a body important as well on account of their secular influence, as of the sacred nature of their functions.^h On the settlement of the new kingdoms, the Church mediated between the victorious and the vanquished; it held up before the rude barbarians the idea of a law higher than human—of a moral power superior to force—of a controlling and vindicating Providence.ⁱ Few of the conquering race were disposed to enter into the ranks of the clergy; their ordination, indeed, was not allowed without the leave of the sovereign, lest the nation should be deprived of its warriors.^k The ministry, unlike other paths to distinction, was open to the ability of the subjugated people, and through it they acquired a powerful influence over their conquerors.^l The clergy were the sole possessors of learning; they were the agents of civilisation, the reformers of law,^m the authorised protectors of the weak;ⁿ they superintended the administration of justice;^o they were often employed as envoys and peacemakers between princes.^p Some had the reputation of miracles; others were venerable and formidable as holding the possession of miraculous shrines—such as that of St. Martin, at Tours.^q Riches flowed in on them; tithes were enforced by canons,^r and large donations of land—a kind of property which increased in value as the people advanced in civilisation—were bestowed on them.^s In order to secure the influence of bishops and abbots, kings endowed their churches and monasteries with estates, to which the usual obligation of military service was attached, and in no long time some of the ecclesiastical holders began to discharge such duties in their own persons.^t Gregory of Tours mentions with horror the warlike achievements

^g Schmidt, i. 347; Löbell, 319.

^h It has been supposed that the regard paid by the barbarians to the clergy was transferred from the priests of their old national idolatries (Mosh. i. 439; Schröckh, xvi. 341). Against this, see Rettberg, ii. 577; Milman, *Lat. Christ.* i. 385.

ⁱ Guizot, i. 34, 38; Löbell, 268-270.

^k Marculf. *Formul.* i. 19 (*Patrol.* lxxxvii.); Schröckh, xvi. 343; Guizot, ii. 32.

^l Gibbon, iii. 418; Guizot, i. 95.

^m Planck, ii. 328-338.

ⁿ See, *e. g.* Conc. Tolet. IV. A.D. 633,

c. 32; Rückert, ii. 349.

^p Planck, ii. 263-5.

^q Schröckh, xvi. 365; Gieseler, I. ii. 447.

^r See Greg. Tur. iv. 2; Schröckh, xvi. 341; Löbell, 274-288.

^s The earliest penal canon as to tithes, is the 5th of the second Council of Mâcon, A.D. 585, which denounces excommunication.

^t Schröckh, xvi. 418, 435-6; Planck, ii. 380-7; Guizot, i. 449.

^u Guizot, i. 119; Rettberg, ii. 566-7. See Ducange, s. v. *Hostis*.

of two brothers belonging to the episcopal order, Salonus and Sagittarius;^u but the feeling of the indecency of such things was gradually blunted among the Franks. The political importance and landed establishment of the bishops gave them the rank of counsellors to the sovereign; their abilities and knowledge often made them the most influential of counsellors.^x Hence in France a system of mixed ecclesiastical and secular councils grew up, which for a time superseded the purely spiritual synods.^y Thus while the bishops gained in spiritual power, the metropolitan jurisdiction was weakened by the disuse of the ancient provincial assemblies, as well as by the circumstance that, in the new partition of the country, the province of a metropolitan might be divided between different kingdoms;^z and the king came to be regarded as the highest judge in ecclesiastical affairs as well as in others.^a

The clergy, like the other Romanised subjects of the Frankish monarchy, continued to be governed by the Roman law.^b They retained all the privileges which it had conferred on them, and, as the conquerors were themselves ignorant of it, the bishops had a large share in the administration of the law among the Roman population in general.^c As the bishops rose, the other clergy, being of the conquered races, sank in relative position. Ordination, indeed, was regarded as emancipating them; but, while priests to the laity,^d they were serfs to the bishops. The old relation of the bishop and his council disappears. The prelates treated their subject clergy with great rudeness, and their power over them became more despotic as the decay of metropolitans and the cessation of provincial synods deprived the clergy of all power of appeal except to the sovereign;^e canons of the time enact bodily chastisement as the penalty for some ecclesiastical offences, while other canons were found necessary to restrain the bishops from beating their clerks at pleasure.^f The clergy some-

^u iv. 43.

^x Planck, ii. 232-241.

^y Schröckh, xvi. 436-7, 439; Planck, ii. 125-135; Gieseler, I. ii. 446; Löbell, 321-3; Rettberg, ii. 265.

^z Planck, ii. 635.

^a Hist. Litt. iii. 17; Planck, ii. 177, seqq.; 638; Gieseler, I. ii. 446.

^b Gibbon, iii. 418; Planck, ii. 106-7; Gieseler, I. ii. 443; Wälder, 178; Rettberg, i. 287-9.

^c Schmidt, i. 348; Rettberg, ii. 638.

^d The second Council of Mâcon, A.D. 585, enacts that, if a layman on horse-

back meet a mounted clerk, he shall uncover his head; if the clerk be on foot, the layman must dismount and salute him, on pain of being suspended from communion during the bishop's pleasure. c. 15.

^e Planck, ii. 366-9.

^f Conc. Matic. I. A.D. 581, c. 8; Conc. Narbon. A.D. 589, cc. 5, 6, 13; Greg. Turon. viii. 22; Perry, 476. In Spain, also, similar canons were required: e.g. Conc. Tolet. III. A.D. 589, c. 20; Conc. Bracar. III. A.D. 675, c. 6.

times attempted to protect themselves by combining against their superiors; such combinations are repeatedly forbidden by councils.^s

The rude princes of Gaul often behaved violently in ecclesiastical affairs.^h The prerogative which Clovis had acquired by his merits towards the Church was extended by his successors.¹ The influence which the Eastern emperors had exercised in appointments to the greater bishopricks, and to those of the imperial residences, was extended by the Frank sovereigns to all; it would seem that the vacancy of a see was notified to the king,—that his license was required before an election, and his confirmation after it.^k Councils repeatedly enacted that bishops should not be appointed until after election by the clergy and people, and with the consent of the metropolitan;^l but the election was often rendered an empty form by a royal nomination, and kings often took it on themselves to appoint and to depose bishops by their own sole power,^m—an usurpation which was facilitated by the connexion with the crown into which bishops were brought by the tenure of their estates. The royal patronage in such cases was often obtained by simony or other unworthy means, and was bestowed on persons scandalously unfit for the office;ⁿ while the change in the manner of appointment combined with other influences to widen the separation between the bishops and the other clergy.^o The license of the sovereign, which under the empire was required only for general councils, was in Gaul requisite for all; the kings composed them at their own will, from larger or smaller districts, of a greater or a less number of bishops, and with such mixture of laymen as they pleased;^p and not content with this, they made many regulations by their own authority in matters concerning religion.^q The wealth of the clergy soon attracted their cupidity,^r and they endeavoured to get a part of it into their own hands by heavy taxation or by forcible acts of rapacity; but on such

^s Conc. Aurel. III. A.D. 538, c. 21; Conc. Rem. A.D. 630, c. 2; Greg. Tur. vi. 11, &c.; Planck, ii. 71; Guizot, ii. 54-6; Gieseler, I. ii. 445; Perry, 477.

^h Löbell, 321.

ⁱ Löbell, 336-350.

^k Planck, ii. 114-8.

^l Conc. Claramont. A.D. 535, c. 2; Conc. Aurel. V. A.D. 549, c. 10; Conc. Paris. III. A.D. 557, c. 8, &c.

^m Planck, ii. 65-6; Guizot, ii. 30; Gieseler, I. ii. 445; Neand. v. 129; Rückert, ii. 360-3.

ⁿ Neand. v. 126-8; Rückert, ii. 497,

seqq.; Perry, 480-3.

^o Guizot, ii. 52; Löbell, 338-9.

^p Planck, ii. 132; Lau, 188; Neander, v. 131.

^q Schröckh, xvi. 344-5.

^r Löbell, 350-1. The complaint of Chilperic I. (that "Nero and Herod of our time," as the bishop of Tours styles him) is famous:—"Ecce pauper remansit fiscus noster, ecce divitiæ nostræ ad ecclesias sunt translatae. Nulli penitus, nisi soli episcopi, regnant; perit honor noster, et translatus est ad episcopos civitatum." Greg. vi. 46.

occasions, it is said, the property of the Church was protected by the judicial infliction of sickness, death, or calamity on her assailants; and by tales and threats of such judgments the clergy were often able to ward off aggression.^s

III. *Monasticism.*

Monachism continued to increase in popularity during the fifth and sixth centuries; but when a system founded on a profession of rigour becomes popular, its corruption may be safely inferred.^t We have seen how in the controversies of the East the monks held all parties in terror—wielding a vast influence by their numbers and their fanatical rage. Justinian made several enactments in favour of Monachism^u—as, for example, that married persons might embrace the monastic life without the consent of their partners,^x children without the leave of parents,^y and slaves without that of their masters.^z Monks more and more acquired the character of clergy, although monasteries had usually only so many ordained members as were necessary for the performance of religious offices, and some of them were without any resident presbyter.^a Leo the Great forbids monks to preach, or to intermeddle with other clerical functions;^b and other prohibitions to the same effect are found.^c As, however, the monks had a greater popular reputation for holiness than the clergy, and consequently a greater influence over the people, it was the interest of the clergy rather to court than to oppose them.^d

The Council of Chalcedon enacted that monasteries should be strictly under the control of the bishops in whose dioceses they were situated, and that no one should found a monastery without the bishop's consent.^e Other councils and the emperor Justinian

^s Gibbon, iii. 418; Planck, ii. 203-9; Löbell, 329; Rettberg, ii. 724-7. "Comme si ceux qui sont saints pour avoir méprisé les richesses sur la terre, étoient devenus intéressés dans le ciel, et employoient leur crédit auprès de Dieu pour se venger de ceux qui pilloient les trésors de ses églises." Fleury, Disc. ii. 3.

^t Mosh. i. 411-2; Gieseler, I. ii. 417.

^u See Novell. v. cxxxiii.

^x Cod. I. iii. 53, 3; Novell. cxxiii. 40.

^y Cod. I. iii. 55.

^z Novell. v. 2. During the probation of three years, to which all monks were to be subjected, fugitive slaves might be reclaimed by their masters, if any

charge of theft or other misdemeanour could be established against them, but not otherwise. After three years the monastic habit was put on, and the slave who had assumed it could no longer be molested. (Ib.) Compare a Constitution of Leo, Novell. Const. x. p. 242.

^a Thomassin, I. iii. 14; Schröckh, xvii. 395, 399-400; Planck, i. 421, 426. As to monks being afterwards ordained in greater numbers, see Guizot, ii. 89-90.

^b Epp. cxviii. 2; cxix. 6.

^c See Theiner, i. 116-8.

^d Planck, i. 427.

^e cc. 4, 8.

issued ordinances of like purport.^f The first country in which this principle was violated was Africa, where, about the year 520, many monastic societies, passing over the local bishops, placed themselves under the primate of Carthage or other distant prelates.^g Throughout the other countries of the West, the local bishop still had the superintendence of monasteries—in so far, at least, as the abbots and clerical members were concerned, although some canons prevented his interference in the relations between the head and the lay brethren.^h

The revolutions of the West were favourable to monasticism. Monks, both by their numbers and by their profession of especial sanctity, impressed the barbarian conquerors. Their abodes, therefore, became a secure retreat from the troubles of the time; they were honoured and respected, and wealth was largely bestowed on them.ⁱ But where the monastic profession was sought by many for reasons very different from those which its founders had contemplated—for the sake of a safe and tranquil life rather than for penitence or religious perfection—a strong tendency to degeneracy was naturally soon manifested.^k And thus in the earlier part of the sixth century there was room for the labours of a reformer.

The person who was to appear in that character, Benedict, was born near Nursia, in the duchy of Spoleto, about the year 480,^l and at the age of twelve was sent to study at Rome; but in disgust at the irregularities of his fellow-students, he fled from the city at fourteen, and, separating himself even from his nurse, who had attended him, he lived for three years in a cave near Subiaco. The only person acquainted with the secret of his retreat was a monk named Romanus, who, having seen him in his flight, was led to take an interest in him; he furnished the young recluse with a monastic habit, and saved from his own conventual allowance of bread a quantity sufficient for his support, conveying it to him, on certain days, by a string let down to the mouth of the cave.^m At length Benedict was discovered by some shepherds; he instructed them and others who resorted to him, and performed a number of miracles. In consequence of the fame which

^f Just. Novell. v. 1; lxvii. 1; Bingham, II. iv. 2; Guizot, ii. 84-5; Gieseler, I. ii. 392.

^g Conc. Carthag. A.D. 525, Labb. et Coss. iv. 1646-9; Conc. ib. A.D. 534, ib. 1785; Thomassin, I. iii. 31, 34.

^h e. g. Conc. Arelat. III. A.D. 455 (Labb. iv. 1024); Mosh. ii. 12; Giese-

ler, I. ii. 425-6.

ⁱ Schröckh, xvii. 397-8; Guizot, i. 120.

^k Schröckh, xvii. 296.

^l Mabill. I. xi. An account of him forms the second of St. Gregory's Dialogues, and may be found in Mabillon, i., Muratori, iv., or the Patrologia, lxvi.

^m Gregor. 1.

he had now attained, he was chosen abbot of a monastery in the neighbourhood; but his attempts at a reformation provoked its inmates, who, in order to rid themselves of him, mixed poison with his drink. On his making the customary sign of the cross, the cup flew in pieces; whereupon he mildly reminded the monks that he had warned them against electing a person of manners so unlike their own, and returned to his solitude.ⁿ His renown gradually spread; great multitudes flocked to him, and even some members of the Roman nobility entrusted their children to him for education; he built twelve monasteries, each for an abbot and twelve monks.^o But finding himself disquieted by the persevering malignity of a priest named Florentius, who, out of envy, attempted to ruin his character and to poison him, he quitted Subiaco, with a few chosen companions, in the year 528.^p After some wanderings, he arrived at Monte Cassino, where Apollo was still worshipped by the rustics, and a grove sacred to the pagan deities continued to be held in reverence. The devil attempted to check him by various prodigies; but Benedict triumphed over such obstacles, cut down the grove, destroyed the idol of Apollo, and on the site of the altar erected an oratory dedicated to St. John the Evangelist and St. Martin—the germ of the great and renowned monastery which became the mother of all the societies of the West.^q Here he drew up his “Rule” about the year 529—the year in which the schools of Athens were suppressed,^r and in which the Semipelagian doctrine was condemned by the Council of Orange.^s

The severity of earlier rules—fitted as they were for the eastern regions in which monachism had originated, rather than for those of the West, into which it had made its way—had become a pretext for a general relaxation of discipline throughout the western monasteries,^t while, on the other hand, it had given occasion for much hypocritical pretension. Benedict, therefore, in consideration of this, intended his code to be of a milder and more practicable kind—suited for European constitutions, and variable in many respects according to the climate of the different countries into which it might be introduced.^u

Every Benedictine monastery was to be under an abbot, chosen by the monks and approved by the bishop.^x The brethren were

ⁿ Gregor. 3. ^o Ibid. ^p Ibid. 8. Guizot, ii. 74.

^q Ib.; Beugnot, ii. 285-7; Guizot, ^u Fleury, xxxii. 19; Mosh. ii. 22-4; Guizot, ii. 80; Gieseler, I. ii. 420; Neander, iii. 374.

^r P. 522. ^s P. 537.

^t Schröckh, xvii. 443, 452, 458-9; ^x Regula, c. 64 (Patrol. lxxvi.).

to regard their head as standing in the place of Christ, and were therefore to yield him an obedience, ready, cheerful, and entire;^y while the founder was careful to impress on the abbots the feeling of responsibility for the authority committed to them, and the duty of moderation in the exercise of it.^z The monks were to address the abbot by the title *Domnus*; in speaking to each other they were not to mention the names of the individuals, but were to use the titles of *Father* (*Nonnus*), or *Brother*, according to their relative age; the younger were to make way for their elders—to rise up to them, to resign their seats to them, to ask their blessing, to stand in their presence, unless permitted by the seniors to sit down.^a Such priests or other clergymen as might be in a monastery, whether specially ordained for its service, or admitted at their own request, were not to claim any precedence on account of their orders, and were to be subject to the abbot, like the other brethren.^b Next in order to the abbot, there might be a prior or provost (*præpositus*); but as, in some monastic societies, where the prior was appointed by the bishop, he assumed an air of independence towards the abbot, the Benedictine provost was to be chosen by the abbot, and was to be subject to him in all things. Benedict, however, preferred that, instead of a prior, the abbot should be assisted in his government by *elders* or *deans* (*decani*).^c With these he was to consult on ordinary occasions, while for important matters he was to take counsel with the whole community.^d

Parents might devote their children to the monastic life.^e Candidates for admission into the order were required to submit to probation for a year, in the course of which the Rule was thrice read over to them, and they were questioned as to their resolution to keep to it. At their reception they laid on the altar a written vow of steadfastness, amendment, and obedience, which those who were unable to write signed with their mark.^f The first of these articles was an important novelty; for whereas formerly, although persons who forsook the monastic for the married state were liable to censures and penance,^g their marriage was yet allowed to continue, the introduction of the Benedictine rule led to the practice of forcibly separating monks who married from their wives, and dragging them back to their monasteries.^h All the property of

^y cc. 15, 63. See Guizot, ii. 77.

^z cc. 2, 3, 27, 64.

^a c. 63.

^b cc. 60, 62.

^c c. 65.

^d c. 3.

^e c. 59. See Ducange, s. v. *Oblati*.

^f c. 58.

^g Basil. Resp. 36.

^h Schröckh, xvii. 453-4; Neand. iii. 373; Gieseler, I. ii. 421-2. Monks were however sometimes allowed to forsake

the novice, if not already distributed to the poor, was to be given to the monastery,ⁱ and a strict community of goods was to be observed by the monks. Their beds were to be often searched, and, if any one were found to have secreted anything as his peculiar property, he was to be punished;^k nor were presents or letters to be received, even from the nearest relation, without permission of the abbot, who was authorised, if he pleased, to transfer any gift to some other person than the one for whom it was intended.^l

A distinctive feature of the Benedictine system was the provision of ample occupation for the monks,—especially of manual labour, which in the western monasteries had as yet been little practised.^m They were to rise at two o'clock for matins;ⁿ to attend eight services daily, or, if at a distance from the monastery, to observe the hours of the services;^o and they were to work seven hours.^p The whole Psalter was to be recited every week in the course of the services.^q Portions of time were assigned for committing psalms to memory, for the study of Scripture, and for reading Cassian's "Conferences," lives of saints, and other devout and edifying books.^r At meals, a book was to be read aloud, but no conversation was to be held;^s and in general there was to be little talk.^t Each monk was required to act as cook in turn, for a week a time;—the cellarer, and those who were engaged in "greater duties," were, however, exempt from this.^u At dinner there were to be two sorts of cooked *pulmentaria*, "that they who cannot eat of the one" (said Benedict) "may perchance be refreshed by the other." These *pulmentaria* included grain and vegetables dressed in various ways; some authorities extend the word to eggs, fish, and even birds, inasmuch as four-footed beasts only are specified as forbidden.^x A third dish, of uncooked fruit or salad, might be added where such things were to be had.^y Each monk was allowed a small measure of wine; because (as Benedict remarked), although monks ought not to taste wine, it had been found impossible to enforce such a rule.^z A pound of bread was the usual daily allowance; but all such matters were

their profession; for it is ordered that their secular clothes shall be kept, in order that if any one, "suadente diabolo," should wish to withdraw ("quod absit"), he may be stripped of the monastic dress, and turned out in his own (c. 58). His petition or vow was to be preserved as a witness against him, in order, according to the Comment (Patrol. lxxvi. 838), that the abbot might still have the power of

reclaiming him.

ⁱ c. 58.

^k cc. 33, 54.

^m Guizot, ii. 75; Gieseler, I. ii. 420.

ⁿ c. 8.

^o c. 48.

^p cc. 42, 73.

^q c. 38.

^r c. 39.

^s c. 39.

^t c. 55.

^u cc. 16, 50.

^v c. 18.

^w c. 38.

^x c. 35.

^y c. 40.

^z See the Comment on c. 39.

to be arranged at the discretion of the abbot, according to the climate and the season, the age, the health, and the employment of the monks.^a Flesh was forbidden, except to the sick, who, while they were to be carefully tended, were required to consider that such service was bestowed on them for God's sake, and not in order that they might be encouraged in "superfluity."^b Hospitality towards strangers was enjoined, and especially towards the poor, "because in them Christ is more especially received;" even the abbot himself was required to share in washing the feet of guests.^c The dress of the monks was to be coarse and plain, but variable according to circumstances.^d They were to sleep by ten or twelve in a room, each in a separate bed, with their clothes and girdles on. A dean was to preside over each dormitory, and a light was to be kept burning in each.^e No talking was allowed after compline—the last service of the day.^f

The monks were never to go out without permission, and those who had been sent out on business were forbidden to distract their brethren by relating their adventures.^g In order that there might be little necessity for leaving the monastery, it was to contain within its precincts the garden, the mill, the well, the bakehouse, and other requisite appurtenances.^h The occupation of every monk was to be determined by the abbot; if any one were disposed to pride himself on his skill in any art or handicraft, he was to be forbidden to practise it.ⁱ Monks were to sell the productions of their labour at a lower price than others—a regulation by which Benedict intended to guard against the appearance of covetousness,^k without, probably, considering how it might interfere with the fair profit of secular persons, who depended on their trades for a livelihood.

In punishments, the abbot was directed to employ words or bodily chastisement, according to the character of the culprit.^l For the lighter offences the monks were punished by being excluded from the common table, and obliged to take their meals at a later hour, or by being forbidden to take certain parts in the service of the chapel; while those who had been guilty of heavier transgressions were entirely separated from their brethren, and were committed to a seclusion in which they were visited by the

^a cc. 39–40.^b cc. 36, 39.^c c. 53.^d c. 55.^e c. 22.^f c. 42.^g c. 67.^h c. 66.ⁱ c. 57. Comp. Basil. Resp. 41–2.^k c. 57. St. Basil says that he would

rather have the productions of his monks sold for somewhat less, than that they should go far in search of a better market. Resp. 39.

^l cc. 2, 23.

most venerable members of the society,^m with a view to their consolation and amendment.ⁿ

Gregory the Great, in his account of Benedict, ascribes to him a multitude of miracles and prophecies. Among other things, it is related that the Gothic king Totila, wishing to have an interview with the saint, made trial of his penetration by sending to him an officer dressed in the royal robes; but that Benedict discovered the device, and afterwards foretold to Totila the course of his successes, with his eventual ruin.^o

Before the death of the founder, which took place in 543,^p the Benedictine system had been established in Gaul, Spain, and Sicily,^q and in no long time it absorbed all the monachism of the West—being the first example of a great community spread through various countries and subject to one rule, although without that organised unity which marked the monastic orders of later times.^r Its ramifications were multiplied under a variety of names; and, although precluded by their vow of obedience from altering their rule, the later Benedictines were able, by means of a distinction between the essential and the accidental parts of it, to find pretexts for a departure in many respects from the original constitutions.^s The monks cleared forests, made roads, reduced wastes into fertility by tillage, and imparted the science of agriculture to the barbarians; they civilised rude populations, and extirpated the remains of heathenism. Although St. Benedict had not contemplated the cultivation of learning in his monasteries—an object which was first recommended to monks by his contemporary Cassiodore^t—it was found to agree well with the regular

^m “Sympectas, id est seniores sapientes fratres.” c. 27. Some read *senipetas*, which is interpreted as = *senium petentes*; but the more correct reading is said to be *sempectas* or *sympectas*—a word which is supposed to be derived from *συμπαικτης*, a playfellow. Ducange (s. v. *Sempecta*) supposes that the old monks were so called because juniors were assigned to them as playfellows; but the editor thinks that the name was rather given to them as being companions of the penitents, whose minds it was their duty to interest. See the description of a *sempecta* in Dr. Maitland's ‘Dark Ages.’

ⁿ cc. 23, 24, 25, 27, 44.

^o Greg. 14–5.

^p Mabill. i. 18. Some say 547. See Dupin, v. 65.

^q From Maur, who introduced it into

Gaul, the celebrated congregation of St. Maur took its name. The existence of St. Maur has been questioned by some Protestants, apparently with very little reason. Schröckh, xvii. 465.

^r Fleury, xxxiii. 13; Mosh. ii. 24; Schröckh, xvii. 433, 462; Gieseler, I. ii. 421; Guizot, ii. 81.

^s Mosh. ii. 23–4.

^t Cassiodore, a senator, after having been employed as secretary by Theodoric and other Gothic kings, and having held high political offices, retired at the age of seventy to the neighbourhood of his native place, Squillace, in Calabria, where he founded the monastery of Vivarium (A.D. 539). It was furnished with a library, and in other respects was widely different from the monastic establishments of the East, as appears from the interesting description which he has

distribution of time, which was a characteristic of the system.^u During the troubled centuries which followed, learning found a refuge in the Benedictine cloisters; the monks transcribed the works of classical and Christian antiquity, and were the chief instruments of preserving them. They taught the young; they chronicled the events of their times; and, in later ages, the learning and industry of this noble order have rendered inestimable services to literature.^x

IV. *Rites and Usages.*

(1.) In matters connected with worship, the tendencies of the fourth century were more fully carried out during the two which followed, by the multiplication and the increased splendour of ceremonies, the gorgeous and costly decoration of churches, and the addition of new festivals.^y

The reverence paid to Saints rose higher; their intercession and protection were entreated, their relics were eagerly sought after, and extravagant stories were told of miracles wrought not only by such relics themselves, but by cloths which had touched them, and by water in which they had been dipped.^z Churches were dedicated to saints and angels; in the West additional altars were erected in honour of the saints;^a and, although the preachers of the time were careful to distinguish between the honour paid to saints and that which belongs to God alone, some of them openly avowed that the saints and their days held in the Christian system a like place to that which had formerly been assigned to the gods of paganism and *their* festivals.^b The presbytery of churches was

left of it (De Instit. Divinarum Litterarum, 29, seqq. Patrol. lxx.). Cassiodore superintended it in the character of patron. The Benedictines claim him as one of their order (Patrol. lxxix. 483), but without sufficient ground. He recommended to his monks the study and the transcription of religious and other writings. He composed many books for their instruction—one of them at the age of ninety-three; and, among other works, compiled the ‘*Historia Tripartita*’—a compendium of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret—which throughout the Middle Ages was the standard authority in the Latin Church for the period which it embraces. The time of his death is unknown. See the Life, by Garet, in Patrol. lxxix.; Baron. 514. 1; 562. 8-23; Dupin, v. 63; Schröckh, xvi. 58; xvii. 137-153.

^u Hist. Litt. iii. 31.

^x “Hunc laborem,” says the great annalist of the order, “strenue exceperunt S. P. Benedicti discipuli, eumque posteris suis quasi testamento reliquerunt. Adeo ut quidquid apud antiquos eruditum ac scitu dignum, quidquid apud Patres pium et sapientiæ plenum, quidquid in Conciliis sanctum, quidquid in libris sacris divinum est, totum id (procul jactantiâ dictum velim) per monachorum nostrorum manus ad hæc usque tempora pervenerit.” Mabill. I. lx.

^y Mosh. i. 471-2; ii. 40; Schröckh, xvii. 481-2.

^z Schröckh, xvii. 485, 502-3.

^a Augusti, viii. 170.

^b Theodoret, Græc. Affect. Cur. Serm. 8 (t. iv. 594, 597); Mosh. ii. 51; Schröckh, xvii. 495-501.

elevated by the construction of a crypt, of which the upper part rose above the level of the nave, with a grating in front, through which was seen the tomb of the patron saint.^c In praying to the saints, as formerly to the heathen deities, it was promised that, if they would grant the petitions addressed to them, their altars should be richly adorned, and candles should be burnt in their honour; but that otherwise the altars should be stripped and the lights extinguished. Sometimes, it is said, such threats were the means of obtaining miraculous aid;^d although, if no such effect followed, the worshippers were generally afraid to execute them. When petitions had been put up in vain to one saint, they were transferred to another.^e In cases of difficulty, the advice of the saints was asked, sometimes by prayer, to which an answer was vouchsafed in visions; sometimes by laying a letter on the grave or altar which contained the relics of the saint, with a paper for the expected answer, which, if the saint were propitious, was given in writing, while otherwise the paper was left blank.^f

Relics of scriptural personages continued to be found. Of this a remarkable instance occurred in the year 487, when Peter the Fuller, then patriarch of Antioch, and strong in the favour of Zeno, revived the claim of jurisdiction over Cyprus, which had been disallowed by the General Council of Ephesus.^g Anthimus, bishop of Constantia and metropolitan of the island, a sound Catholic, was summoned to appear at Constantinople, and answer the Monophysite patriarch's claims. On the eve of his departure from Cyprus, he was visited in his sleep by the Apostle St. Barnabas, who discovered to him the resting-place of his remains. The body was found accordingly, and with it a copy of St. Matthew's Gospel, written by the hand of St. Barnabas. Anthimus proceeded to Constantinople, and met the apostolical pretensions of Antioch by this proof that his own Church also could boast an apostolical origin. The emperor gladly admitted it, and expressed great delight that his reign had been distinguished by so illustrious an event; whereupon Peter returned discomfited to Antioch, and the autocephalous independence of Cyprus was established beyond all controversy.^h

Spurious relics were largely manufactured.ⁱ Lives of recent

^a Hope on Architecture, 88.

^d See a case in which a dead child was restored by St. Martin. Greg. Tur. de Mirac. St. Mart. iii. 8.

^e Neand. v. 183; Rückert, ii. 196-9.

^f Rückert, ii. 203.

^g See p. 477.

^h Theod. Lector, ii. 2; Baron. 485. 4, seqq.; Tillem. xvi. 379-380; Schröckh, xvii. 503.

ⁱ A Spanish canon of A.D. 592 may be mentioned here, although it falls just beyond the period embraced in this volume. With a view of testing, not

saints were composed—full of miraculous recitals. Saints of older date were supplied with biographies in a like spirit of accommodation to the prevailing taste; and imaginary saints, with suitable histories, were invented.^k

(2.) The Nestorian controversy had a very important effect in advancing the Blessed Virgin to a prominence above all other saints which had been unknown in earlier times. When the title of Theotokos had been denied to her, Cyril, Proclus, and the other opponents of Nestorius burst forth in their sermons and writings into hyperbolical flights in vindication of it, and in exaltation of the Saviour's Mother.^l In this Eutychians vied with Catholics; the Monophysite Peter of Antioch was the first who introduced the name of the Virgin into all the prayers of his Church.^m Justinian invoked the aid of St. Mary for the prosperity of his administration;ⁿ Narses never ventured to fight a battle unless he had previously received some token of her approval.^o The idea of a female mediator—performing in the higher world offices akin to those labours of mercy and intercession which befit the feminine character on earth—was one which the mind of mankind was ready to receive;^p and, moreover, this idea of the Blessed Mary was welcomed as a substitute for some which had been lost by the fall of Polytheism.^q The veneration of her, therefore, advanced rapidly, although it was not until a later period that it reached its greatest height.

(3.) The religious use of images and pictures gained ground.^r Figures of the Blessed Virgin—in some cases throned, and with the infant Saviour in her arms—were introduced into churches.^s It was during this time that stories began to be current of authentic likenesses of the Saviour, painted by St. Luke or sent down from heaven;^t and of miracles wrought by them in healing the sick, casting out devils, procuring victory against enemies, and the like.^u The use of images obtained more in the East than

the genuineness but the orthodoxy of relics, it enacts that such as might be found in Arian places of worship should be tried by fire. Hard. iii. 533.

^k Gieseler, I. ii. 427-9.

^l Schröckh, xvii. 489-90; Augusti, iii. 35.

^m Tillem. xvi. 376; comp. 691.

ⁿ Cod. Just. I. xxvii. 1.

^o Evagr. iv. 24. Excess of reverence for the Blessed Virgin is curiously combined with another superstition of the time, in a story that the mother of a maiden debauched by Zeno, having prayed to St. Mary for vengeance on

him, had a vision of the Theotokos, who told her that the emperor's alms suspended the punishment due to his crimes. Moschus, Prat. Spirituale, 175 (Patrol. lxxiv.).

^p Bayle, art. "Nestorius," note N.

^q Beugnot, ii. 262-4.

^r Schröckh, xvii. 503-4.

^s Mosh. i. 472; Schröckh, xvii. 496.

^t The first mention of such things is by Theodore the Reader (i. 1), A.D. 518. Gieseler, I. ii. 430.

^u Evagr. iv. 27; Gibbon, iv. 280; Neander, iii. 416-8.

in the west.^x Leontius, bishop of Neapolis, in Cyprus, at the end of the sixth century, eloquently defends the worship (*προσκύνησις*) of them, in token of honour towards those whom they represent; and he speaks of miraculous images from which blood trickled.^y On the other hand, Xenaias or Philoxenus, a bishop of the Syrian Hierapolis, who was notorious as a Monophysite in the early part of the century, ejected all images out of churches.^z

(4.) To the festivals of general observation was added in the sixth century that of the Presentation, or, as it was styled in the East, the *Hypapante*—the *meeting* with Symeon in the temple. The first celebration of it at Constantinople was in 542.^a The Annunciation was also probably celebrated in the sixth century, as it was fully established in the next. In most countries it was kept on the 25th of March, although in Spain and in Armenia other days were chosen, in order that it might not interfere with the Lenten fast.^b These festivals, although having the Saviour for their primary object, fell in with the prevailing tendency to exalt the mother of his humanity;^c and hence it was that, after a time, the title of “The Presentation in the Temple” was superseded by that of “The Purification.” The Nativity of St. John the Baptist appears to have been also now generally observed—the more naturally because Midsummer was marked by festival rites both among the Romans and among the northern nations. It is mentioned as a principal festival by the Council of Agde, in 506.^d

The earliest witness for the observance of Advent in the Latin Church is Maximus of Turin, in the fifth century.^e The season was regarded as penitential; fasting was prescribed for three days in each week,^f and the Council of Lerida, in 524, enacted that no marriages should be celebrated from the beginning of Advent until after the Epiphany.^g It would seem that at Rome the number of Sundays in Advent was five, although afterwards reduced to four; while at Milan, in Spain, and in Gaul the season extended to six weeks, beginning on the Sunday after Martinmas, from which it was styled the “Quadragesima of St. Martin.” In the east, also,

^x Neand. iii. 416; Gieseler, I. ii. 430.

^y See the quotations from him in the Second Council of Nicæa, Hard. iv. 193-201.

^z Ib. 305; Cedrenus, 353.

^a It has been supposed that the Presentation took the place of the Lupercalia, which had been celebrated at nearly the same time of the year. Its later title, the Purification, also points to a coincidence with the *Februa*, so called “quia populus *februaretur*, i. e.

lustraretur.” See Martene, iii. 45; Mosh. ii. 51; Schröckh, xvii. 194, 486-7; Augusti, i. 153, iii. 84, seqq.

^b Martene, iii. 204; Mosh. ii. 52, n.; Schröckh, xvii. 485. See p. 439, n. v.

^c Bingham, XX. viii. 4-5; Gieseler, I. ii. 431.

^d Can. 21.

^e Homil. 1-4 (Patrol. lvii.).

^f Conc. Matic. I. A.D. 581, c. 9.

^g c. 17.

it lasted forty days, although the observance of it was less strict than in the west.^h The fast of the Rogation-days, with its litanies and processions, was instituted by Mamercus, bishop of Vienne, during a time of distress and terror among his people, occasioned by the last eruptions of the volcanos of Auvergne,ⁱ about the middle of the fifth century; and the observance of it was soon adopted elsewhere, although it was not established at Rome until the pontificate of Leo III., about the year 800.^k

(5.) In the doctrine of the sacraments no alteration is to be noted during this period. With respect to the Eucharist, however, writers and preachers became more rhetorical in their language, so that some of their expressions might, if they stood alone, imply the later doctrine of the Romish Church. But that no one as yet doubted the continued subsistence of the elements in their own nature, while a higher virtue was believed to be imparted to them by the consecration, appears from other expressions which are clear and unequivocal.^l Chrysostom, in a letter written during his exile, distinctly lays down that, while the consecrated bread is dignified with the name of "the Lord's Body," yet the nature of the bread itself remains unchanged;^m and the illustration which he draws from this, as to the union of natures in the person of the Redeemer—an illustration obviously inconsistent with the more modern teaching of Rome—was continually repeated in the course of the controversies which followed.ⁿ

The practice of communicating in one kind only was of so much later introduction in the Church, that it would be premature to advert to it here, but for the decided language in which it was condemned by Gelasius I.:—"A division of one and the same mystery," he declares, "cannot be made without great sacrilege." It is needless to refute, or even to characterise, the explanations which Romish writers have devised in order to evade this prohi-

^h See Menard on the Gregorian Sacramentary, *Patrol.* lxxviii. 433-4; Martene, iii. 26-7; Augusti, iii. 177-184.

ⁱ Sidon. Apollin. *Epp.* v. 14 (*Patrol.* lviii.); Avitus, *Hom. de Rogationibus*, ib. lix. 289; *Quart. Rev.* lxxiv. 294-7. That there had before been some less regular celebrations, see *Patrol.* lviii. 29.

^k Anastas. 189; Bingham, XXI. iii. 8. It is prescribed by the First Council of Orleans (A.D. 511). c. 27.

^l Neander, iv. 437. See quotations from Theodoret, Gelasius, Facundus, &c., in Schröckh, xviii. 589; Neander,

iii. 437-8; Gieseler, I. ii. 435-6; Hagenbach, i. 370, seqq.

^m *Ep. ad Caesarium*, *Opera*, t. iii. 742-6. The epistle does not exist complete, except in a Latin translation, although fragments of the Greek are quoted by John of Damascus. Some Romanists have questioned its genuineness; but Tillemont (xi. 475-9) and Noël Alexandre (vii. 311) honestly avow their opinion in favour of it. *Comp. Schröckh*, x. 475-9, and the curious history of its publication in Routh's *Scriptt. Eccl. Opuscula*, ii. 123-6.

ⁿ Neand. iii. 437.

bition—by restricting the words of Gelasius to the priest alone, or by saying that, as they were directed against the Manichæans, they relate to those sectaries only, and have no application to Catholics, inasmuch as these do not *abhor* the reception of the eucharistic cup.^o

Canons were now found necessary to enforce the reception of the Lord's Supper. Thus the Council of Agde, held under the presidency of Cæsarius of Arles, in 506, enacted that no secular person should be accounted a Christian unless he communicated at Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide.^p The same council ordered that the people should not leave the church until after the priest's benediction;^q and the First Council of Orleans, in 511, directed that they should remain until the solemnity of the mass should be finished, after which they were to depart with a blessing.^r The meaning of these canons appears to be, that those who did not intend to communicate were to retire after a blessing, which (as may be seen in the Mozarabic and Gallican liturgies)^s intervened between the consecration and the administration of the sacrament;^t so that a formal sanction was thus given to a practice which at an earlier time had provoked the denunciations of Chrysostom and other writers. In connexion with this was introduced a custom of giving to the non-communicants, as if by way of substitute for the Eucharist, portions of the bread offered at the altar, which were blessed by the priest, and were designated by the name of *eulogiæ*.^u

(6.) In the penitential discipline of the Western Church, an important change was introduced by Leo the Great. Until his time, penance had been public, and the offence of each penitent

^o See Baron. 496. 20; Schröckh, xvii. 182, 505. There is, of course, also the device of denying the genuineness of the fragment, which is preserved by Gratian (Decret. III. ii. 12; Patrol. clxxxvii.). Thus it is printed among doubtful writings of Gelasius, in the Patrologia, lix. 141.

^p Can. 17.

^q c. 47.

^r c. 26; Cf. Conc. Aurel. III. A.D. 534, c. 29.

^s Patrol. lxxii., lxxxv.

^t See Mabill. de Liturg. Gallic. I. iv. 14 (Patrol. lxxii.); Bingham, XV. iii. 29; iv. 2; Augusti, viii. 225.

^u Bingham and Augusti, as above; Gavanti, Thes. Sac. Rituum, i. 220, 277, ed. Aug. Vindel. 1763. In earlier times, this name had been applied to

the Eucharist itself (see 1 Cor. x. 16). The origin of *eulogiæ*, in the later sense of the word, does not appear to be clearly ascertained. Some (but evidently with a controversial rather than a purely historical object) would carry it up at least as high as the beginning of the fourth century. The term is used by Augustine (e.g. Cont. Litt. Petil. iii. 19), and in his correspondence there is frequent mention of sending blessed loaves as a token of Christian communion (Ep. 24 fin.; 25 fin.; 31 fin.; xxxii. 3). It would seem that the "blessed bread" was given to Catechumens as a substitute for the Eucharist before it was so given to those who were entitled to communicate. See Ducange, s. vv. *Eulogiæ*, *Fermentum*, *Panis Benedictus*.

was read aloud from a written record;^x but Leo, with a view, as he professed, to removing an impediment which might deter many from repentance, declared such exposures to be unnecessary: "for," he writes, "that confession is sufficient which is made, first to God, and then also to the priest, who approaches as an intercessor for the sins of the penitent."^y The effect of this was to abolish the ordinary performance of public penance, and to substitute for it the practice of secret confession only.^z

V. *Decline of Learning.*

From the middle of the fifth century learning had been on the decline in the Church, and towards the end of the sixth hardly any other than ecclesiastical literature continued to be cultivated. "Alas for our days!" exclaimed the contemporaries of Gregory of Tours, "for the study of letters hath perished from among us, neither is there one found among the nations who can set forth in records the deeds of the present time."^a The barbarian invasions—the necessity in troubled times of directing all activity to practical purposes,^b—the extinction of paganism, with the consequent removal of the motive by which Christian teachers had been obliged to qualify themselves for arguing with learned heathens—the dislike and scorn with which the monkish spirit regarded pagan letters and philosophy—all combined in producing this result. Even among the works of Christian authors, all but such as were of acknowledged orthodoxy were prescribed;^c and this also operated towards the discouragement of learning. Nor did the age produce any writers whose genius could rise above its depressing and narrowing influences. The most distinguished of those who lived in the middle or towards the end of the century, such as Cassiodore and the encyclopedic Isidore of Seville,^d did for the most part little beyond abridging and compiling from the works of earlier times;^e and the popularity of their productions had the effect of throwing the originals into the shade.

* Marshall infers from Aug. de Symbolo ad Catechum. i. 15, that the publication of offences was forborne, where suppression seemed advisable (Penitential Discipline, 45, ed. Ang. Cath. Lib.). But the passage does not seem to prove this, and in any case it appears from Leo that there was no such custom in the Roman church.

^y Ep. clxviii.

^z See Hooker, VI. iv. 7-8; Marshall, 104-8; Augusti, ix. 167-9.

^a Greg. Præf.

^b Guizot, ii. 99, 102.

^c The first list of forbidden books was issued by a Roman council under Gelasius, A.D. 494; Patrol. lix. 163, seqq.

^d Hallam, Hist. of Literature, i. 3. For Cassiodore, see p. 564; for Isidore, vol. ii. Book III. c. iii. s. 2.

^e Mosh. i. 429; ii. 41-4; Schröckh, xvi. 49, 54; Gieseler, I. ii. 382-3.

Yet in this sad time—amid corruption of doctrine and of morals, while talent degenerated, while learning sank, and civilisation was overwhelmed—not only may we believe that the Gospel was secretly and gradually fulfilling its predicted work of leavening the mass in which it had been hidden,^f but even on the very surface of things we can largely discern its effects. It humanises barbarians, it mitigates the horrors of war and of slavery, it teaches both to conquerors and to conquered something of a new bond superior to differences of race, it controls the oppression of brutal force by revealing responsibilities beyond those of this present world. We see the Church not only bearing within it the hope of immortality, but rescuing the intellectual treasures of the past from the deluge of barbarism, and conveying them safely to later generations.^g

^f St. Matth. xiii. 33.

■ See Rose's 'Christianity always Progressive,' 74–82.

INDEX.

ABASGI.

A.

ABASGI, conversion of, 538.
 Abbots, 317.
 Abdas, 433.
 Abgarus, 3.
 Abraxas, Abrasax, 49.
 Absolution, 172.
 Abyssinia, church of, founded, 289; becomes Monophysite, 533; religious war, 539.
 Acacians, 229; pretend orthodoxy, 249.
 Acacius, bp. of Amida, 433.
 —, bp. of Berrhœa, 382, 384, 389, 442, 450-2.
 —, bp. of Cæsarea, 224, 229, 293; death of, 253.
 —, bp. of Constantinople, 508, 545; resists Basiliscus, 508; gives him up to Zeno, *ib.*; breaks with Felix of Rome, 511; his death, 512; treatment of his memory, 517.
 Acephali, 510, 514, 525.
 Acesius, Novatianist bishop, 121.
 Achilles, bp. of Alexandria, 196.
 Acemētæ, monks, 511.
 Acolyths, 157.
 Advent, season of, 568.
 Æneas of Gaza, 503.
 Æons, 39.
 Ærius, 357.
 Aëtius (anomœan), 228, 230, 232.
 —, (general), 430, 434.
 Africa, foundation of the church in, 3; character of its Christianity, 188; church of, independent, 306, 416-8, 480; monachism unpopular in, 320; Vandal invasion of, 430; the church's independence suffers in consequence, 481; persecution of Catholics in, 498-504; attempts to recover for the empire, 487; subdued by Belisarius, 503, 520; restoration of the church, *ib.*; conduct of the bishops in the controversy as to the Three Articles, 526-8.
Agape (love-feast), 167, 348.
 Agapetus, bp. of Rome, 523-4.
 Agnoëtes, 516.
 Agricola, Pelagian, 491.
 Agrippinus, bp. of Carthage, 122.
 Alaric, 367-9, 377.
 Alban, martyr, 151.
 Alcibiades, martyr, 176.

AMMONIUS.

Alexander, bp. of Alexandria, excommunicates Arius, 199; attends the Nicene Council, 204; dies, 207.
 —, bp. of Antioch, 393; ends the Eustathian schism, 381; claims jurisdiction over Cyprus, 477.
 —, bp. of Constantinople, 203; prayer of, against Arius, 212; death of, 218.
 —, bp. of Hierapolis, 454-5.
 —, bp. of Jerusalem, 99, 101, 103, 105.
 Alexandria, Church of, founded by St. Mark, 2; philosophical schools of, 38, 91; catechetical school, 87, 99, 198, 327; character of Alexandrian Christianity, 88-91, 197; massacre under Caracalla, 101; eminence of the Church, 159, 302-4; question as to metropolitans, 447, 462; power of patriarch, 302, 471; parochial division of the city, 198; destruction of the Serapeum at, 277-8; language of Alexandrians on the Incarnation, 436, 458; Monophysite distractions of the Church, 533; decline of its influence, 545.
 Allegorical interpretation of Scripture, 38, 89-90, 106-8.
 Alogi, 76.
 Altars, 162; use of stone for, 345.
 Alypius, bp. of Thagaste, 324, 398, 407.
 Amalaric, 541.
 Ambrose, friend of Origen, 102, 108.
 —, abp. of Milan, 260, 285, 308, 355, 358, 479; election and character of, 267; sells his church-plate, 268; influences Gratian, *ib.*; his struggle with Justina, 268-271; discovers relics of Gervasius and Protasius, 270; St. Augustine a hearer of, and baptised by him, 397-8; his expeditions to Treves, 268, 271, 288; disapproves the execution of Priscillian, 288; influences Theodosius, 271; his conduct in the affair of Callinicum, 272; puts Theodosius to penance, 273; funeral oration over Valentinian II., 274; exerts himself against Paganism, 275; answers Symmachus, 278; his zeal for celibacy, 319; liturgical labours, 347; his death, 275.
 Ammianus Marcellinus on the character of the clergy, 308.
 Ammon, monk, 318.
 Ammonius Saccas, 91-3, 100.

Ammonius, monk, 330, 385.
 Amphilocheus, bp. of Iconium, 283.
 Anagogical interpretation of Scripture, 108.
 Anastasius, bp. of Antioch, 531.
 — I., bp. of Rome, 376-7.
 — II., 514.
 —, emperor, 498, 512-6.
 —, Nestorian, 438.
 Anatolius, bp. of Constantinople, 467-8, 472; Leo suspends and resumes intercourse with him, 476-7; further disagreements, 484; the emperor Leo crowned by him, 506.
 Andrew, St. (Apostle), 2.
 —, bp. of Samosata, 443, 452.
 Angels, 355.
 Amianus, bp. of Orleans, 434.
 Anicetus, bp. of Rome, 30, 76.
 Annunciation, festival of, 438.
 Anomœans, 228-9, 254. (See *Eunomians*.)
 Anthemius, emperor, 488.
 Anthimus, bp. of Constantinople, 523.
 —, bp. of Nicomedia, 146.
 —, bp. of Tyana, 259.
 —, metropolitan of Cyprus, 566.
 Anthropomorphism, 373-4, 385.
 Antidicomarianites, 355.
 Antioch, Church of, 2, 15, 159, 302-4; schools of, 197; council of, A.D. 341, 216, 256, 297; schism of (see *Eustathius*, *Meletius*), 233, 247; end of the schism, 381; council and creed of, A.D. 360, 233; sedition at, 273, 379; language on the Incarnation, 437; decline of the church's influence, 545.
 Antoninus Pius, emperor, 22.
 —, M. Aurelius, emperor, 25; his dislike of Christianity, 27; persecution under, 26-33; deliverance of in the Quadian war, 28.
 —, bp. of Ephesus, 384.
 Antony, hermit, 177, 215, 313-6, 332, 335-6, 354.
 Aphthartodocetism, 516, 531-3.
 Apiarius, 480.
 Apollinaris, bp. of Hierapolis, 34.
 — (or Apollinarius), bp. of Laodicea, a Chiliast, 115; his heresy, 265-6.
 Apollinarianism, 247, 265-6, 355, 436-8, 458.
 Apollonius, martyr, 64.
 Apologies, 20, 34.
 Apostles, labours of, 1-4; festivals of, 171, 350.
 Apostolical canons, 7.
 — churches, 159, 548.
 — constitutions, 7, 158.
 Appeals to Rome forbidden, 480; how sanctioned by the Council of Sardica, 304.
 Aquileia, church of, 305; separates from Rome, 531.
 Arabia, Christianity in, 2, 102, 105, 153, 293.

Arcadius, emperor, 285, 367, 388-393.
 Archdeacons, 300.
 Archelaüs, bp. of Cascara, 134.
 Archimandrites, 317.
 Architecture, 344.
 Arch-presbyters, 301.
 Arianism, 196, 265, &c.; traced by some to Origen, 108, 372; wrongly imputed to Dionysius of Alexandria, 113; character of Arius, 198; commencement of the heresy, 199; Arius excommunicated, *ib.*; writes his *Thalia*, *ib.*; his doctrines, 202-3; condemned at Nicæa, 206; recalled from banishment, 208; alliance of Arians and Meletians, 209; death of Arius, 212; parties among the Arians, 227-9; intrigues of the Arians, 215, 221; their ambiguous creeds, 217, 228; number of their creeds, 233; decline of the party, 245, 255; laws against, 283; Arians persecuted by Nestorius, 435; Arianism of the Goths, 268, 293, 380; of other barbarians, 489; persecution of Catholics by Arians in Africa, 498-503; Arianism extirpated in Africa and Italy, 520; in Gaul and Spain, 541-2; professed by the Lombards only, 542.
 Arius. (See *Arianism*.)
 Aristides, 19.
 Arles, councils at, 72, 192, 223; contentions about precedence, &c., 417, 482.
 Armenia, church of founded, 153; becomes Monophysite, 532.
 Arnobius, 152.
 Arsacius, abp. of Constantinople, 392.
 Arsenius, Meletian bishop, 210.
 Art, Christian, 172, 345, 567.
 Artemon, 83-4.
 Articles, the Three. (See *Three Articles*.)
 Ascension-day, 170.
 Ascetics, 176.
 Aspebethos, Saracen bishop, 538.
 Asylum, right of, 299, 383, 540.
 Athanasian creed, 504.
 Athanasius, 313-6, &c.; appears at Nicæa, 205; is made bishop of Alexandria, 207; character of, *ib.*; refuses to admit Arius to communion, 209; appears before a council at Tyre, *ib.*; has an interview with Constantine, 210; exile at Treves, 211; is restored to his see, 215; deposed by a council at Antioch, 216; takes refuge at Rome, 217; introduces monachism there, 319; appears at Sardica, 220; is again restored, 221; renewed intrigues against him, 222; is expelled by Syrian, 225; third exile, *ib.* 245, 290; returns under Julian, 245; holds a council, 246; fourth exile and return, 248-9; is consulted by Jovian, 249; last years and death, 252-3; opposes the Pneumatomachi, 255; writes against Apollinarianism, 265; consecrates a bishop for Abyssinia, 289; de-

fends Origen, 108, 372; excommunicates a governor of Libya, 299; his fourth oration against the Arians, 221; his life of Antony, 313; asserts toleration, 288; his letter to Dracontius, 330; language as to the Incarnation, 436.

Athenagoras, 34.

Athens, schools of, 236, 256; closed by Justinian, 522.

Attalus, emperor, 367-9.

——, martyr, 32, 176.

Atticus, bp. of Constantinople, 392-3, 436.

Attila, 434.

Audius, Audians, 292.

Augustine, St., 338, 346, 349; early years of, 395; becomes a Manichæan, 142, 396; at Rome and at Milan, 271, 397; is converted, 398; is ordained presbyter and bishop, 399; his labours and writings, 400; his book "Of the City of God," 370, 400; his dealings with the Donatists, 403, *seqq.*; his accounts of them, 195-6; appears at the conference of Carthage, 407; endeavours to suppress Agapæ, 348; introduces monachism in Africa, 320; recovers Tertullianists to the church, 81; not a Traducianist, 419; his opinions on the manner of opposing idolaters, 373; on rebaptism, 125; on the use of falsehood, 271, 285; on ritual excess, 343; on Jerome's translation of Scripture, 329; on Jerome's quarrel with Rufinus, 377; on reverence of saints, 353; on episcopal judgments, 298; writes *de Bono Conjugali*, 359; declines bequests, 309; opinions on toleration, 409; on miracles, 364; on grace and free will, 410, 420, *seqq.*; on the Blessed Virgin's nature, 423; illustrates the doctrine of the Incarnation, 436; his characters of Pelagius and Cœlestius, 412; preaches and writes against Pelagianism, 324, 413; his system of doctrine, 420-5; convinces Leporius, 423; writes on predestination and election, 425; against Semipelagianism, 429; last years and death, 430-1; is invited to the council of Ephesus, 445.

Augustulus, last emperor of the West, 487.

Aurelian, emperor, 26; confirms ejection of Paul of Samosata, 132; orders a persecution, *ib.*; his death, 133.

Aurelius, bp. of Carthage, 400, 407, 413.

Auxentius, Arian bp. of Milan, 250, 267.

Avitus, emperor, ordained, 311.

——, bp. of Vienne, 498, 536, 541.

B.

Babylas, bp. of Antioch, 96-7.

Bairam, Persian King, 433.

Baptism, administration of, 162-5; in the fourth century, 347; season of, 163,

347; delay of, 348; clinical, 119, 164; of infants, 164, 423; Augustine's views on, 424; by heretics, 122-5, 193.

Baptisteries, 345.

Barcochab, 20.

Bardesanes, 34, 153.

Barnabas, St., 2, 566; epistle ascribed to, 7, 89.

Barsumas, abbot, 462-5.

Bartholomew, St., 2, 87.

Basil, bp. of Ancyra, 228, 232.

——, bp. of Cæsarea, account of, 256-8, *seqq.*; his dealings with Valens, 260; St. Jerome's character of him, 259; places Gregory at Sasima, *ib.*; his liturgical labours, 347; introduces monachism in Pontus, 257, 319; suggests monastic vows, 320; death of, 262.

Basilicas, 344.

Basilides, Gnostic, 49-52.

——, Spanish bishop, 129, 159.

Basiliscus fails in an expedition against the Vandals, 487; usurps the empire, 507; interferes in controversy, *ib.*; is ejected and put to death, 508.

Belisarius, 489, 524; recovers Africa and Italy for the empire, 503, 520-1, 540.

Benedict of Nursia, 559-565.

Beryllus, bp. of Bostra, 105.

Bishops, origin of, 8, 17; advance of their power, 128, 158, 309; canons restraining, 309; manner of their appointment, 158, 309, 557; income of, 307; canons as to translation, 263, 308; judicial power of, 297-8, 553; jurisdiction over monasteries, 559; position of in western kingdoms, 555-8.

Blastus, quartodeciman, 71.

Boëthius, 519.

Boniface I., bp. of Rome, 480; his contest with Eulalius, 484.

—— II., condemns Semipelagianism, 537.

——, general, 430, 434.

Bonus, bishop of Sardica, 355, 357.

Boscoi (grazing monks), 338.

Books, first prohibitory list of, 536, 571.

Britain, Christianity in, 2, 147, 151-2-4, 490, 543; pilgrimages from, 339, 355; visit of German and Lupus, 491; Saxon invasion, 492; no Christian remains found in, *ib.*; peculiarities of the church, 544.

Buddhism, supposed to be connected with Manichæism, 133, 135, 138-9.

Burgundians are converted, and lapse into Arianism, 489; re-converted, 541.

C.

Cæcilian, 189, 301; made bishop of Carthage, 190; schism against him, 191; attends the Nicene council, 204.

Cæsarea, in Palestine, library of, 102, 150, 328; see of, 159, 474.

Cæsarius, bp. of Arles, 536, 540, 570.

Cainites, 39.
 Caius, Roman presbyter, 45.
 Callistus, bp. of Rome, 85-6.
 Candida Casa, see of, 493.
 Candidian, 445-9.
 Capreolus, bp. of Carthage, 445.
 Caracalla, emperor, 65, 70; massacre at Alexandria under, 101.
 Carpocrates, Gnostic, 37, 40, 173.
 Carthage, plague at, 121; maintenance of clergy at, 161; third council of, 334; fourth council, 308-9; conference between Catholics and Donatists at, 405-7; conference between Catholics and Arians, 501.
 Cassian, 427-8, 537, 562.
 Cassiodore, 564, 571.
 Cataphrygians, 75.
 Catechetical school, *see* Alexandria.
 Catechumens, 162; styled Christians, *ib.*; division of, 347; allowed to be readers and singers at Alexandria, 158.
 Cathari, 120.
 Celibacy, 177, 183, 311, *seqq.*, 551-2. *See Monasticism, Virginity.*
 Celsus writes against Christianity, 33; ridicules Christians as vulgar, 155; is answered by Origen, 34, 108.
 Cerdon, heretic, 59.
 Cerinthus, heretic, 6, 44-5.
 Ceylon, Christians in, 538.
 Chalcedon, conference at, 450; general council of, 301-2; its meeting, 467; trial and deposition of Dioscorus, 468-471; discussions and decree as to the Incarnation, 471-3; attendance of Marcian, 473; case of Theodore, *ib.*; Jerusalem made a patriarchal see, 474; canons as to Constantinople, 474, 545; effect as to the Roman see, 483; disputes respecting, 505, 529, *seqq.*; canon as to monks, 558.
 Chanting, antiphonal, 270.
 Charity of Christians, 174.
 Cherson, 507.
 Chiliasm, 113-5.
 Chilperic, 557.
 Chorepiscopi, 160-1, 301.
 Chosroes, king of Persia, 522.
 Christians, number of before the conversion of Constantine, 156; social position of, 155.
 Christmas, 170, 350.
 Chrysaphius, 459, 462, 466.
 Chrysostom, St. John, 343, 353, 411, 428, 441, &c.; early years of, 378; his book on the priesthood, *ib.*; his opinions as to monasticism, 331; as to miracles, 364; as to the Eucharist, 569; his homilies on the Statues, 379; becomes bishop of Constantinople, *ib.*; his labours, 380; withstands Gainas, *ib.*; mediates in the schism of Antioch, 381; makes enemies by his reforms, and by his manner of life, 381-2; shelters Eutropius, 383; his expedition to Ephesus,

384, 475; intrigues against him, 384; receives the "Long Brothers," 386; enmity of Theophilus, *ib.*; is cited to the synod of the Oak, 388; is banished and recalled, 389; fresh troubles, 390; again banished, 391; his life at Cucusus, 392; his death, 393; translation of his body, 394.
 Church and State, relations of, 294-7, 545-551.
 Churches, 162, 344.
 Circumcellions, 195-6, 338, 404.
 Cirta, synod of, 189.
 Claudius, emperor, 4.
 Clemens, Flavius, 155.
 Clement of Alexandria, 88-92, 99, 107, 156.
 Clement, bp. of Rome, 2, 6; his epistle to the Corinthians, 6, 161; spurious writings ascribed to, 7.
 Cleomenes, heretic, 85.
 Clergy, position, privileges, and restraints of, 161, 182, 306-7, 553-8; maintenance of, 161, 307, 555.
 Clinical Baptism (*see Baptism*).
 Clotilda, 496.
 Clovis, conversion of, 496; character and conquests of, 497-8, 540.
 Coelestine, bp. of Rome, 480; orders the deposition of Nestorius, 442, 480; sends legates to Ephesus, 445; sends Palladius to Ireland, 494; condemns Semi-pelagianism, 534.
 Coelestius, 412; is condemned at Carthage, *ib.*; ordained at Ephesus, 417; acknowledged by Zosimus, *ib.*; generally condemned, 418-9.
 Cœnobitic life, 316.
 "Coessential" (*see Homobusion*).
 Colluthus, 199, 200.
 Collyridians, 354.
 Columba, 542-4.
 Commodus, emperor, 64.
 Communion (*see Eucharist*); of infants, 165; in one kind, origin of, 168; condemned by Gelasius, 569.
 Confessors, privileges of, 116.
 Confirmation, 165.
 Constans, emperor, 214; supports Athanasius, 220; his policy towards the Donatists, 196-7.
 Constantia, sister of Constantine, 208, 345.
 Constantine the Great; early years of, 179; becomes emperor, 147; grants toleration to the Christians, 151; his vision of the Cross, 180-1; legislation and conduct of, 181-3; becomes sole emperor, 184; avows himself a Christian, 185; founds Constantinople, 186; religion of, 186-7; takes part in controversies, 188; his dealings with the Donatists, 191-4; interferes in the Arian controversy, 200; summons the First General Council, 201; takes part in it, 205-6; his speech to Acesius, 121; his edict against Arius, 206; is gained by the Arians, 208;

- banishes Athanasius and patronises Arius, 209-211; his baptism and death, 213; fables as to his baptism and "Donation," &c., 213; apotheosis of, 237; translation of his body, 232; his division of the empire, 302; correspondence with Antony, 215, 315; law as to episcopal judicature, 297; gifts to the Church, 306; allows the Church to receive bequests, 183, 307; his position towards the Church, 292-4; claims to be "bishop," 294; intercedes for Christians of Persia, 291.
- Constantine the younger, 211, 214-5.
- Constantinople, foundation of, 186; precedence assigned to the bishop, 265, 303; mission of Gregory Nazianzen to, 261; first General Council of, 262-5, 303, 475; creed of, 264; bishop of, under court influence, 394, 545; Home or Local Synod of, 460, 475; influence of the bishops extended, 475; jurisdiction assigned to by the Council of Chalcedon, *ib.*; breach of with Rome, 512; reconciliation, 517; church of St. Sophia at, 521; second council of, 529; increase of influence in fifth and sixth centuries, 545.
- Constantius Chlorus, emperor, 143; friendly to Christians, 147; his religion, 179.
- Constantius, son of Constantine, 307; becomes emperor, 214; character of, *ib.*; falls under Arian influence, *ib.*, 222; interference in ecclesiastical affairs, 214, 295-6; interview with Athanasius, 220; with Liberius and others, 224; orders the expulsion of Athanasius, 225, 290; visits Rome, 226; is won by the Acaicians, 232; deprives Macedonius, *ib.*; state of paganism in his reign, 237; his conduct to Julian, 235-6; his baptism and death, 234.
- "Consubstantial" (see *Homoousion*).
- Copiatæ, 300.
- Coronation of emperors, 506.
- Cornelius, bp. of Rome, 118-120, 122.
- Cosmas Indicopleustes, 538.
- Councils, institution of, 159, 302.
- Councils, General. I. Nicæa, 201-6; II. Constantinople, 262-5; III. Ephesus, 444; IV. Chalcedon, 467; V. Constantinople, 529; summoned by emperors, 201, 204, 219, 262, 297, 444, 483; power of summoning not yet claimed by popes, 547.
- Creds used at baptism, 163.
- Crimea, Christians in, 380.
- Cross, use of the sign, 162, 173; crosses set up in churches, 173, 346.
- , Constantine's vision of, 180-1; other visions of, 181, 244.
- , finding of, 188; multiplication of, 355.
- Crucifix, 346.
- Curial offices, exemption of the clergy from, 182, 306.
- Cuthbert, bp. of Lindisfarne, 336.
- Cyprian, 96-7, 115, 158, 171, 177; is chosen bishop of Carthage, 116; retires from his see, *ib.*; dealings with the lapsed, 117; is opposed by Novatus and Felicissimus, 117-121; behaviour in the plague, 121; controversy with Stephen, of Rome, on re-baptism, 123-5; denounces corruption of morals, 96; last days and martyrdom of, 125-7; his opinions, 127-9; error respecting in our calendar, 115.
- Cyprus, ecclesiastical independence of, 477, 566.
- Cyril, bp. of Alexandria, 440; accompanies Theophilus to Constantinople, 441; behaviour as to Chrysostom, *ib.*; writes against Nestorius, 441-2; some language as to Rome falsely ascribed to him, 442; his anathemas, 443; appears at Ephesus, 445; opens the council, 446; gains the court by bribery, 450, 453; deposed, 450; restored, 451; reconciled with John of Antioch, 453; attempts to censure Theodore and Diodore, 456; death of, 459; his book, against Julian, 244.
- Cyril, bp. of Jerusalem, 181, 262.
- Cyrila, Arian patriarch, 501.

D.

- Dalmatius, monk, 449, 450.
- Damasus, bp. of Rome, 252-4-9, 260, 279, 285, 308, 322-3, &c.
- Daniel, stylite, 340, 508.
- Datius, abb. of Milan, 528.
- Deacons, 8; in some churches limited to seven, 157, 300; assumptions of, *ib.*, 309; preach and baptize, 300.
- Deaconesses, 13, 157.
- Dead in Christ, commemoration of, 171.
- Death, first infliction of, for heresy, 287; justified by Leo the Great, 481.
- Decius, persecution under, 96-7, 116, 119.
- Decretal epistles, 304, 547.
- Decurionate, 182.
- Dedication, creed of the, 218, 232, 251.
- Defensors, 553.
- Demetrias, virgin, 324, 413.
- Demetrius, bp. of Alexandria, 100-4.
- Demurge, 39.
- Demophilus, Arian bp. of Constantinople, 253, 260.
- Denys, St., 150, 154.
- Deogratias, bp. of Carthage, charity of, 486, 499.
- Development of Doctrine, 81-3.
- Didymus, of Alexandria, 327, 373.
- Dioceses, civil, 302.
- Diocletian, emperor, 142; his wife and daughter Christians, 142-3, 146, 155; persecution under, 143-7; abdication of, 147; his edict against Manicheans, 142.
- Diodore, bp. of Tarsus, 437; attempt to censure his memory, 456-7.

Diognetus, epistle to, 59.
 Dionysius the Areopagite, 154; works ascribed to, 505.
 —, bp. of Alexandria, 97-8; mediates in controversy as to re-baptism, 127; deals with Sabellians, 113; with Millennarians, 114; discourages Novatian, 121; gives explanation of language supposed to be heretical, 113; his conduct in the plague, 175; death of, 131.
 —, bp. of Paris, see *Denys*.
 —, Exiguus, 544-7.
 —, bp. of Milan, 223.
 —, bp. of Rome, 113.
 Dioscorus, bp. of Alexandria, 459; anathematizes Theodoret and others, *ib.*; receives Eutyches to communion, 461; presides at the *Latrocinium*, 463; his violent behaviour there, 463-5; excommunicates Leo, bishop of Rome, 470; tried and deposed at Chalcedon, 468-470; his death, 471.
 — bp. of Hermopolis, 386.
 Diospolis, synod of, 413.
 Diptychs, 167.
Disciplina Arcani, 91.
 Divination, laws against, 183, 237, 275, 281.
 Divinity of Christ, 202; of the Holy Ghost, 254.
 Docetism, 17, 40.
 Domitian, emperor, persecution under, 5, 11, 155.
 Domitilla, Flavia, 155.
 Domnus, bp. of Antioch (cent. 3), 132.
 —, bp. of Antioch (cent. 5), 460, 465, 474.
 Donatism, 189, 350, 401-9, 430; origin of, 189-191; appeal to Constantine, 191; condemned at Rome, Arles, and Milan, 192-3; character of the sect, 192; the Circumcellions, 195-6; the sect suppressed by Macarius, 197; recalled by Julian, 401; state under his successors, *ib.*; internal schisms, 402; measures against, 404; conference of Carthage, 405-8; new penal laws, 408-9; decline of the sect, 409.
 Donatus, bp. of Casæ Nigræ, 192.
 — "the Great," 192-3; his banishment and death, 197.
 Dorotheus, Nestorian, 441.
 Dracontius, abbot, 330.

E.

Easter, 169; etymology of the name, *ib.*; controversies as to time of, 29, 70-2, 201, 206; how reckoned, 349; celebration in the fourth century, 350; objected to by Aërius, 357; British reckoning of, 542; baptism administered at, 163, 347.
 Ebionism, 46-50.

Eclecticism, 91-3.
 "Ecumenical Bishop," 546.
 Edessa, Church of, 3, 153; seminary at, 457.
 Elagabalus, emperor, 70.
 Eleusinian mysteries, 19, 238; abolition of, 369.
 Eleutherius, bp. of Rome, 76, 154.
 Eliberis, council of, 162; canons of, against paintings in churches, 173; on celibacy of clergy, 177, 312; against provoking death, 149, 189.
 Elxaites, 46.
 Emperors, position of, as to the Church, 294-7; the highest judges, 297; get patronage of the great sees, 310; summon General Councils (see *Councils*); some of them forcibly ordained, 311; their interference in election of popes, 485, 550.
 Empire, division of by Constantine, 302; eastern and western separated, 367; fall of the western, 487.
 Encratites, 34.
 Energumens, 157.
 Ephesus, church of, under St. John, 6; General Council of, 420, 444-451, 474, 477, 480; council called *Latrocinium* at, 462-5.
 Ephrem, 34, 319.
 Epigonus, 85.
 Epiphanius, bp. of Constantia, 329, 373; visits the Holy Land, 374; tears a veil with a picture on it, 345; goes to Constantinople, 387; his death, *ib.*
 Epiphany, 50, 170, 347, 350.
 Ethiopia, see *Abyssinia*.
 Eucharist, Holy, administration of, 166-8; daily, 168; in the fourth century, 348; neglect of, 343; superstition respecting, 348; in the fifth century, 569-570.
 Eudocia, wife of Theodosius II., 432, 441, 506.
 Eudoxia, wife of Arcadius, 383, 388-392.
 —, wife of Valentinian III., 432; marries Maximus, invites the Vandals, and is carried to Carthage, 486.
 Eudoxius, bp. of Antioch, 230, 293; translated to Constantinople, 233, 303; baptises Valens, 251; death of, 253.
 Eugenius set up as emperor, 275, 282.
 —, bp. of Carthage, 500-3.
 Eulalius, candidate for bishopric of Rome, 484.
Eulogie, 453, 460, 570.
 Eunapius, 353; his remarks on monks, 347.
 Eunomians, 229, 254, 284. (See *Anomæans*.)
 Eunomius, 229, 283, 355.
 Euodius, bp. of Antioch, 2.
 Euphemius, bp. of Constantinople, 512-3, 517.
 Euric, persecution by, 498, 536.
 Eusebians, see *Arians*.

EUSEBIUS.

GRATIAN.

- Eusebius, bp. of Cæsarea (the Church historian), 150, 180, 187, 199, 204, 235; defends Origen, 372; favours Arius, 199; his behaviour at Nicæa, 205-6, 208; at the Council of Tyre, 209; his account of Constantine's vision, 180-1; opinions of, 204, 228; opposes the use of images, 345; his death, 229.
- , bp. of Dorylæum, charges Nestorius with heresy, 439; charges Eutyches with heresy, 460; is condemned at the Latrocinium, 465; appears at Chalcedon, 468.
- , bp. of Emesa, 216.
- , bp. of Nicomedia, 198-9, 200, 204, 212, 290; is banished, 206; recalled, 208; baptises Constantine, 213; translated to Constantinople, 218; death of, *ib.*
- , bp. of Vercelli, 223, 246-8.
- Eustathians, 233, 381.
- Eustathius, bp. of Antioch, 204, 208, 233.
- , bp. of Sebaste, 257, 311, 319.
- Eustochium, 324-330, 416.
- Eutropius, 379-383.
- Eutyches, monk, zealous against Nestorianism, 468; is charged with heresy and condemned at Constantinople, 460-1; is acknowledged by Dioscorus, 461; appears at the Latrocinium, 463; teaches a sort of Docetism, 505; last notices of, 476.
- Eutychianism, see *Eutyches*, *Monophysitism*.
- Eutychius, bp. of Constantinople, 529.
- Euzoius, 208; becomes bishop of Antioch, 233; baptises Constantius, 234; death of, 253.
- Exarchs, ecclesiastical, 302; governors of Italy, 521.
- Exorcism at baptism, 163.
- Exorcists, 157-8.

F.

- Fabian, bp. of Rome, 97, 118.
- Fabius, bp. of Antioch, 120.
- Facundus, bp. of Hermiane, 528.
- Falsehood for good ends approved, 91, 271, 285; opposed by St. Augustine, 271, 285.
- Fasts, 169, 351, 568-9.
- Faustus, Manichæan, 136, 342, 396.
- , bp. of Riez, 535-7.
- Felicissimus, schismatic, 118-121.
- Felicitas, martyr, 69.
- Felix, bp. of Aptunga, 190.
- II., intruded bp. of Rome, 224, 227.
- III., pretends to depose Acacius, 510-1.
- IV., 520, 549.
- Ferrandus, 527.
- Festivals, 169-171, 350, 568.
- Firmicus Maternus, 238.
- Firmilian, bp. of Cæsarea, 105, 124, 131, 171.

- Flavian, bp. of Antioch (4th cent.), 263, 379, 381.
- , bishop of Antioch (6th cent.), 514, 517.
- , bishop of Constantinople, story of with Chrysaphius, 460; condemns Eutyches, 460-2; appears at the Latrocinium, 464; is condemned and dies, 464-5.
- Forbidden occupations and amusements, 175.
- France, see *Gaul*.
- Franks, conversion of, 497; rudeness of their Christianity, 539; state of the Church among, 555-8.
- Fravitta, bp. of Constantinople, 512, 517.
- Fredegund, 539, 540.
- Frumentius, apostle of Abyssinia, 289.
- Fulgentius, bp. of Ruspe, 504, 537.
- Fundanus, letter of Hadrian to, 20.

G.

- Galerius, emperor, 143-8.
- "Galileans," Christians so called by Julian, 242.
- Gallienus, emperor, legalises Christianity, 130.
- Gallus, emperor, 97.
- Gallus, brother of Julian, 235-6.
- Gangra, council of, 311, 334.
- Gaudentius, Donatist bishop, 409.
- Gaul, Christianity in, 32, 72, 154. (See *Franks*.)
- Gelasius, bp. of Rome, 486, 511, 514, 536, 569.
- Gelimer, 503, 520.
- Generid, 368.
- Gennadius, bp. of Constantinople, 340.
- Genseric invades Africa, 430; sacks Rome, 486, 488; defeats expeditions sent against him, 487; his Arianism, 490; persecutes the Catholics, 498-9.
- George of Cappadocia, intruded as bp. of Alexandria, 226; murder of, 241, 245.
- , bp. of Laodicea, 228.
- , St., patron of England, 150.
- Georgia, conversion of, 390.
- Germain, bp. of Auxerre, 491, 494.
- Germany, Christianity in, 153, 495.
- Gladiatorial shows, 186; abolished, 371.
- Glycerius, emperor, ordained, 311.
- Gnosticism, 37-40, 63.
- Gordian, emperor, 95.
- Goths, conversion of, 153, 292; they become Arians, 293; their alphabet, *ib.*; endeavours of Chrysostom to convert, 380; Arianism of, 489, 498; their kingdom in Italy, 517-521; re-conversion of, 541-2.
- Government of the Church, 7-9, 17.
- Gratianus, Serennius, 20.
- Gratian, emperor, 254, 305; gives general toleration, 254; which is afterwards

limited, 260; banishes Priscillian, 285; measures against Donatists, 401; against Paganism, 279; refuses the pontifical robe, 284; murder of, 268.
 Greek language in the Western Church, 79.
 Gregory, intruded into Alexandria, 216; death of, 221.
 — the Great, 368, 437, 520.
 — the Illuminator, 153.
 — of Nazianzum, 256-7, 334, 348; bp. of Sasima, 259; retires to Seleucia, 260; mission at Constantinople, *ib.*; inducted into the chief church, 262; installed as bishop, *ib.*; resigns, 264; death of, *ib.*
 —, bp. of Nyssa, 257, 348; against pilgrimages, 356.
 — Thaumaturgus, 97, 104-5, 131, 171.
 —, bp. of Tours, 538.
 Gundamund, 503.

H.

Hadrian, emperor, 19-21.
 Helena of Tyre, 41-3.
 Helena, mother of Constantine, 187; her pilgrimage to the Holy Land, 188, 355.
 Helvidius, 355, 357.
Henoticon of Zeno, 509, 513, 517.
 Heraclas, bp. of Alexandria, 100, 104.
 Heresies, early, 35; change in the character of, 73; heresy more strictly defined, 283; first infliction of death for, 284-7.
 Hermas, "Shepherd" of, 7.
 Hermenegild, 541-2.
 Hermits, 176.
 Hermogenes, heretic, 81.
 Heros, bp. of Arles, 415-7.
 Heruli, conversion of, 538.
 Hætarie, law against, 11, 65.
 Hilarion, monk, 319, 354-5, 374.
 Hilary, bp. of Arles, 481-3.
 —, bp. of Poitiers, 232, 248, 253, 255, 288, 334.
 —, legate of Leo at Ephesus (afterwards bishop of Rome), 465.
 —, opponent of Semi-Pelagianism, 429, 534.
 Hilderic, 499-500.
 Hippolytus, bp. of Portus, 83, 85. (See *Philosophumena*.)
 Holy Ghost, doctrine concerning, 254; procession of, 264.
 Holy seasons, 168.
 Homerites, 539.
 Homilies, 166.
Homoiousion, 205, 228, 249, 256.
Homoöusion, 132, 205, 218, 231, 250-1, 256.
 Honorius, emperor, 367, 552-3; intercedes for Chrysostom, 393; abolishes Gladiatorial shows, 361; laws, &c., against the Donatists, 405, 408; against the Pelagians, 418.
 Hormisdas, King of Persia, 135.

Hormisdas, bp. of Rome, 516-7, 536.
 Hosius, bp. of Cordova, 200, 295-6; at the Nicene Council, 204, 311; at Sardica, 219, 304; is banished, 224; subscribes an Arian creed, and dies, 226.
 Hunneric, persecution of Catholics by, 499-503.
 Hypatia, 440.
Hypostasis, 246, 322.
 Hypsistarians, 256.

I.

Ibas, bp. of Edessa, 457-9, 473, 525-9. (See *Three Articles*.)
 Iberia, conversion of, 290.
 Ignatius, bp. of Antioch, 15; is condemned by Trajan, 16; his journey to Rome, *ib.*; epistles, 14, 17-8; martyrdom, 19.
 Illyricum added to jurisdiction of Rome, 479.
 Images, 567.
 Incarnation, doctrine of, 436, 458.
 Incense, use of, 342.
 India, Christianity in, 3, 87, 290, 538.
 Infants, baptism of, 164; opinions of Pelagius and Cælestius on, 423.
 —, communion of, 165.
 —, confirmation of, 165.
 Innocent, bp. of Rome, 369, 381, 416, 428, 479; corresponds with Chrysostom, 392-3.
 Inspiration of prophets, 74.
 Intercession for offenders, 299.
 Iona, 543.
 Ireland, Christianity in, 493, 524.
 Irenæus, bp. of Lyons, 71-2, 152-3.
 Isidore of Pelusium, 440, 448, 453.
 — of Seville, 571.
 Italy, conquered by Odoacer, 487; by Theodoric, 517; recovered by Justinian, 521.
 Ithacius, Spanish bishop, 285-8.

J.

Jacob al Baradai, 532.
 Jacobites, 532.
 James the Just, 4-5.
 Jerome, St., 306, 308, 357, &c.; early years of, 321; his retirement in Syria, *ib.*; he learns Hebrew, *ib.*; his vision, 322; is ordained at Antioch, and goes to Rome, 323; his life there, *ib.*; becomes unpopular, and leaves Rome, 326-7; settles at Bethlehem, 327; labours on the Scriptures, 330; his admiration of Origen, 372; becomes an Anti-Origenist, 373; controversies with John of Jerusalem and Rufinus, 375-7; abets Theophilus against Chrysostom, 387, 393; writes against Jovinian, 358-9; against Vigilantius, 361-2; opposes Pelagius,

JERUSALEM.

LEO.

- 413-6; attacked by Pelagians, 416; his death, 330; his character of Basil, 259; his account of the temples, 283; argument on unity, 306; life of Paul the hermit, 313; zeal for monachism, 334; letter to Demetrias, 324; on pilgrimage, 356; on usages of churches, 479.
- Jerusalem, siege of, by Titus, 4; church of re-established, 5; name of changed by Hadrian, 21; church of adopts Gentile usages, 21, 46; churches built by Helena, 188; attempt of Julian to rebuild the Temple, 243; pilgrimages to, 355; Synod of, in case of Pelagius, 414; the bishoprick erected into a patriarchate, 474.
- Jews, calumnies of against Christians, 10; revolt of, under Barcochab, 20; forbidden by Constantine to molest Christians, 182; favoured by Julian, 243; expelled from Alexandria, 440; law against, 518.
- Joannites, 391-4.
- John, St., Apostle, 6, 35, 44.
- , bp. of Antioch, 442-3, 474; at the Council of Ephesus, 445-8; reconciled with Cyril, 453; ejects bishops, 454-5.
- , Chrysostom, see *Chrysostom*.
- , bp. of Constantinople, reconciled with Rome, 516.
- , bp. of Jerusalem, 373-5, 414.
- , bp. of Rome, mission to Constantinople and death of, 519.
- , Talaia, 509-512.
- , monk of the Thebaid, 330, 333.
- Joseph of Arimathea, 154.
- Jovian, emperor, 249.
- Jovinian, 358-360.
- Judaizing sects, 45.
- Jude, St., grandchildren of, 6.
- Judicature, ecclesiastical, 297.
- Julian, bp. of Cos, 484.
- , bp. of Eclanum, 418-420, 431.
- , emperor, 226, 353; early years of, 235; administration in Gaul, 236; assumes the purple, *ib.*; becomes sole emperor, 237; apostasy of, 238; his religion, 239; his residence at Antioch, *ib.*; re-establishes paganism, 240; his measures against Christianity, 240-1; denounces monasticism, 337; forbids Christians to teach the classics, 242, 265; attempts to reform paganism, 243; attempts to rebuild the Temple, *ib.*; writes against Christianity, 244; recalls Christian exiles, 245; again banishes Athanasius, 248; recalls the Donatists, 401; his death, 244.
- Julius, bp. of Rome, 217, 219, 304.
- Justin I., emperor, 516; crowned by the pope, 519.
- , martyr, 41, 43, 75, 84, 152, 166; account of, 27; his first apology, 23; second apology and martyrdom, 29.
- Justina, empress, 250; her contest with Ambrose, 268-271; death, 274.
- Justinian, emperor, 516, 552, 567, &c.; conquests of Africa and Italy under, 520-1; his character, 521; limits the right of asylum, 299; his buildings, 344, 521-2; closes the schools of Athens, 522; his edicts against heresy, 523; his religious policy, 523, 549-550; condemns the "Three Articles," 526; controversy on the question, 527, *seqq.*; becomes an Aphthartodocete, and dies, 531.
- Justiniana Prima, patriarchate of, 550.
- Juvenal, bp. of Jerusalem, presides at the Council of Ephesus, 450; appears at Chalcedon, 469, 471; his see erected into a patriarchate, 474; he is excluded from it, but restored, 505-6.

L.

- Labarum, 180, 249.
- 'Labyrinth,' authorship of, 83-4.
- Lactantius, 144, 182, 342; authorship of 'De Mortibus Persecutorum,' 144.
- Lampsacus, Council of, 251.
- Laodicea, Council of, 216, 255-301.
- Lapsed, treatment of, 117-121.
- Latin, ecclesiastical, 79.
- Latrocinium*, council so called, 463-5; origin of the name, 466.
- Laura*, 319.
- Laurence, martyr, 98.
- , antipope, 549.
- Laws, effect of the Gospel on, 298.
- Lay elders, 190.
- Lazarus, bp. of Aix, 415-7.
- Lazi, conversion of, 538.
- Leander, bp. of Seville, 542.
- Learning, decline of, 571.
- Legacies, the Church allowed to receive, 183, 307; restriction as to, 308-9.
- Lent, 169, 351.
- Leo I., bp. of Rome, 480; advances the power of his see, *ib.*; proceeds against heretics, 481; opposes Pelagianism, 420, 481; forbids monks to preach, 558; his conduct to Hilary of Arles, 482; obtains a law in his favour, *ib.*; his letter to Flavian, 463; sends legates to Ephesus, *ib.*; denounces the Ephesian synod, 465; his negotiations for a new synod, 466-7; sends legates to Chalcedon, 467; is excommunicated by Dioscorus, 470; his letter approved at Chalcedon, 471, 483; his reception of the council's decisions, 476; relations with Anatolius, 467, 476-7, 484; intercedes with Attila, 434; and with Genseric, 486; his change in the penitential system, 571.
- , I., emperor, 340, 487, 506.

Leontius, bp. of Antioch, 198, 220, 229.
 Leovigild, Spanish king, 541-2.
 Leporius, 423, 436.
 Lerins, monastery of, 534.
 Letters of communion, 149, 174.
 Libanius, 244, 378; pleads for temples, 276; his character of monks, *ib.*
 Libellatics, 116.
Liber Diurnus, 550.
 Liberius, bp. of Rome, 223; is carried to Milan and banished, 224; submits to Constantius, and recovers his see, 226; opposes the creed of Rimini, 231; receives Semiarians to communion, 252; death of, *ib.*
 Licinius, emperor, 147, 151, 184.
 Lights in the day time, 342, 361.
 Liturgy, primitive, 166; in the 4th century, 347.
Logos, title of, 202; doctrine respecting, 84.
 Lombards, invasion of Italy by, 540, 557; Arianism of, 542.
 "Long Brothers," 385-7.
 Lord's Day, see *Sunday*.
 Lucian of Antioch, 150, 197.
 Lucidus, 535.
 Lucifer, bp. of Cagliari, banished, 223; recalled, 246; his proceedings at Antioch, 247; founds a schism, *ib.*; his death, 253.
 Luciferians, 247, 284.
 Lucilla, 190, 353.
 Lucius, Arian bp. of Alexandria, 246, 253.
 —, British king, 154.
 Lupercalia, 488.
 Lupus, bp. of Troyes, 491, 552.
 Lyons and Vienne, martyrs of, 32-3, 76, 176.

M.

Macarius, commissioner to the Donatists, 197.
 — the elder, monk, 318.
 — the younger, 334-6.
 Macedonians, 251, 253, 284.
 Macedonius, bp. of Constantinople (4th cent.), 218, 222, 251, 255; deposed, 233.
 —, bp. of Constantinople (6th cent.), 513-7.
 Macroscopic creed, 219.
 Magic, proceedings against, 275. (See *Divination*.)
 Magnentius, 214, 222-3.
 Magnetism, 74-5, 203, 366.
 Majorian, emperor, 487.
 Majorinus, schismatic, 191-3.
 Malchion, 132.
 Mamercus, bp. of Vienne, 569.
 Mammæa, mother of Alexander Severus, 94, 102.

Manes, Greek account of, 133; Oriental account of, 134; derivation of his name, *ib.*
 Manichæism, 136-142; progress of the sect, 142; practice of disguise, *ib.* 348, 396, 499; laws, &c. against the sect, 142, 254, 284, 396, 481, 518.
 Marcella, 323-5, 377.
 Marcellina, Gnostic, 30.
 —, sister of St. Ambrose, 319.
 Marcellinus, bp. of Rome, 150.
 —, commissioner to Catholics and Donatists, 405-8.
 Marcellus, bp. of Ancyra, 205, 211, 217, 219, 221, 372.
 Marcian, bp. of Arles, 129, 159.
 —, emperor, 434, 466-7, 473-6-7, 506.
 Marcion, 22, 30, 59-63, 81.
 Marcionites, 65, 443.
 Maria, S. in Trastevere, church of, 94.
 Mark, St., 2.
 —, bp. of Arethusa, 235, 240.
 Martial, Spanish bishop, 129, 159.
 Martin, bp. of Tours, 493-4; promotes monachism, 320; intercedes for Priscillian, 286-7; his behaviour at court, 308; miracles of, 336, 354; contention for his body, 354; miracles at his shrine, 496, 555.
 Martyrs, privileges of, 77, 116, 149; intercession of limited to this world, 170; festivals of, *ib.*; honours paid to, 352; martyrdom not to be rashly sought, 18, 149.
 Maruthas, missionary in Persia, 433.
 Matthew, St., 2.
 Matthias, St., 2, 9.
 Maur, St., 564.
 Maurice, St., 144.
 Mavia, Saracen queen, 294.
 Maxentius, 148, 151, 180.
 Maximian, emperor, 143-9.
 —, Donatistic bishop, 402.
 —, bp. of Constantinople, 451-2-3-5.
 Maximilla, 73, 75.
 Maximin the Thracian, emperor, 95, 105.
 —, colleague of Diocletian, 148-51, 314.
 Maximus, pretender to Constantinople, 261-3.
 —, usurper, 268-271; puts Priscillianists to death, 287.
 —, emperor, 435, 486.
 —, bp. of Turin, 488.
 —, heathen philosopher, 238, 275.
 Melania, 373, 377.
 Melchiades, bp. of Rome, 192.
 Melchites, 533.
 Meletius, bp. of Antioch, 247-9, 378, &c.; appointed and deposed, 233; restored, 262; presides at the Second General Council, *ib.*; his death, *ib.*
 —, bp. of Lycopolis, schismatic, 198, 304; his followers combine with the Arians, 209.
 Melito, bp. of Sardis, 34.

Memnon, bp. of Ephesus, 445-8, 450-1.
 Menander, heretic, 43, 48.
 Mennas, bp. of Constantinople, 523-9.
 Mensurius, bp. of Carthage, 146, 189, 190.
 Mercator, Marius, 420, 443.
 Methodius, bp. of Tyre, 150.
 Metropolitans, origin of, 159; in Egypt, 448, 462; consecration of them transferred from suffragans to patriarchs, 475.
 Milan, Church of, 2, 305, 530; councils at, 193, 223.
 Millennarianism, 44-5, 48, 113.
 Miltiades, apologist, 34.
 Minor orders, 157.
 Minucius Felix, 34.
 Miracles, 272, 364-6.
Missæ Catechumenorum and *Fidelium*, divison of, 168; when disused, 347.
Monarchia, heresies relating to, 81.
 Monasticism, 313-341; progress of, 257, 319, 558-565; variety of rules, 320; no vows at first, *ib.*; monks originally laymen, 330; their efforts in destroying temples, 276, 337; descriptions of them by heathens, *ib.*; their interference with justice, 299, 336; their devotional exercises, 317, 335; exemption from episcopal jurisdiction, 559; opposition to Arianism, 245, 253, 255; their interference in controversies, &c., 337; forbidden to preach, 558; measures of Valens against them, 253; good and evil of the system, 331-7.
 Monica, 349, 395-9.
 Monophysitism, 506, 516, 523, 532, &c.
 Montanus, Montanism, 34, 65, 70-5, 121, 523; chiliasm of the sect, 75, 114; influence on the Church, 77.
 Moral character of Christians, 173.
 Moses, bp. of the Saracens, 294.
 Mucius, monk, 333.
 Mursa, battle of, 222.
 Mysteries, tolerated by Valentinian I., 276; suppressed, 369.
 Mystical interpretation of Scripture, 90, 107-8.

N.

Narses, 521, 530, 540, 567.
 Natalius, 84.
 Nazarenes, 45.
 Nectarius, bp. of Constantinople, 264, 381; abolishes the office of penitentiary priest, 351.
 Neoplatonism, 91-3; extinction of, 522.
 Nepos, Chiliast, 114.
 Nero, persecution by, 4; laws of, 11.
 Nerva, emperor, 6.
 Nestorianism in the East, 3, 457, 538.
 Nestorius, appointed bishop of Constantinople, 435; his zeal against heretics, *ib.*; favours the Pelagians, 420; is charged with heresy, 438; his relation to Theodore of Mopsuestia, *ib.*; cor-

respondence with Cyril and Coelestine, 441-2; answers Cyril's anathemas, 443; condemned by the Council of Ephesus, 445-7; asks for another council, 448; deposed and banished, 451; question as to his opinions, *ib.*; his end, 455-6.
 Nicæa, General Council of, 72, 121, 203-6; attempts to heal the Meletian schism, 209; creed of, 206; completion of the creed, 264; prohibition of adding to it, 461, 464; canon on *subintroductæ*, 312; canon on ecclesiastical jurisdiction, 302-4; canon as to two bishops in a city, 399; canon against translation of bishops, 263; discussion as to marriage of clergy, 311; determination as to Easter, 206, 349.
 Nicenes, the later, 216, 254-5.
 Nicolaitans, 43.
 Ninian, 493.
 Nisibis, school of, 538.
 Nitria, monks of, 318, 327, 372, 384.
 Noëtus, 83, 85-6.
Nonnæ (nuns), 318; age of profession for, 334.
 Novatian, 118-20; his book on the Trinity, 113.
 Novatianists, 120-1; make common cause with the Catholics against Arianism, 222; tolerated by Theodosius, 284; adhere to Quartodecimanism, 349; persecuted at Constantinople and Alexandria, 436, 440.
 Novatus, 117-20.
 Nubia, converted by Monophysites, 538.
 Numidia, primacy of, 189.

O.

Oblations, 161.
 Odoacer, 487, 496, 517, 548.
 Olympias, 382, 392.
 Ophites, 39.
 Optatus, bp. of Milevis, 402.
 —, bp. of Thamugade, 402.
Opus operatum, 164.
 Orange, Council of, 537.
 Ordination, 158, 310; forcible, 310, 375.
 Origen, 43, 95-6, &c.; early life of, 98-102; is ordained, 103; leaves Alexandria, 104; lives at Cæsarea, 104-5; his homilies, 166; his book *De Principiis*, 375; the *Hexapla*, 102, 105, 328; book against Celsus, 34, 108; visits to Arabia, 102, 105; death, 105; his opinions, 106-12; on the death of martyrs, 171; on miracles, 364; his writings corrupted, 108; his system of interpretation, 90, 106; testimony to the progress of the Gospel, 152-4-5; questions as to his opinions, 108-11, 361, 372, seqq., 525.
 Original sin, 410.
 Orleans, First Council of, 498.
 Orosius, 370, 411, 414-6.

Ostiaries (doorkeepers), 157.
Ousia, 246.

P.

Pachomius, abbot, 316-18, 320, 330, 372;
 his sister, 318.
 Paganism, origin of the term, 237; state
 of, under Constantius, *ib.*; restored by
 Julian, 240; state of, under Valentinian
 and Valens, 275; under Theodosius, &c.,
 276-283; the Serapeum, 278; the altar
 of Victory, 279; state under Arcadius
 and Honorius, 368-71; decay of, 487-9;
 laws against, 518, 523; influence of, on
 Christianity, 342, 357.
 Paintings, forbidden by the Council of
 Eliberis, 173; some in Constantine's
 palace, 186; use of, in the 4th century,
 345-6; in the 6th century, 567. (See
Art.)
 Pall, use of the, 549.
 Palladius, missionary to Ireland, 494.
 Palm, synod of the, 549.
 Pammachius, 359, 376.
 Pamphilus, 150, 372.
 Pantænus, 87-8.
 Paphnutius defends the marriage of the
 clergy, 311.
 Papias, bp. of Hierapolis, 114.
 Parabolani, 300, 440.
 Paraclete, character of, claimed by Simon
 Magus, 42; by Montanus, 74; by Manes,
 134.
 Parmenian, Donatist, 402.
 Parochial division at Alexandria, 198.
 Paschal lamb, 358.
 — letters, 385.
 Patriarchs, title of, 159, 302, 475, 545;
 increase of their power, 477.
 Patrick, apostle of Ireland, 494-5.
 — the elder (Sen-Patrick), 495.
 Patripassianism, 86.
 Patronage, 554.
 Paul, St., Apostle, 2-4.
 —, first hermit, 97; 177, 313.
 — the Simple, 334.
 —, bp. of Constantinople, 218, 222.
 —, bp. of Emesa, 452.
 — of Samosata, bp. of Antioch, 130-2,
 197, 439.
 Paula, 325-30.
 Paulinian, 328; ordination of, 375.
 Paulinus, bp. of Antioch, 247, 250, 263,
 381.
 —, biographer of St. Ambrose, accuses
 Cælestius, 412, 417.
 —, bp. of Nola, 344, 360-2, 411, 418.
 Pelagianism, 481; in Britain, 491.
 Pelagius, 411; in Africa, 412; his letter
 to Demetrias, 324, 413; at Jerusalem,
 414; at the synod of Diospolis, 415;
 condemned in Africa and at Rome,
 417-19; at Ephesus, 420; his death,
ib.; doctrines, 420-5.

Pelagius I., bp. of Rome, 526, 530.

— II., 547.

Pella, Christians at, 5.

Penance, 171-2, 351, 570.

Penitentiary priests instituted, 172; abo-
 lished, 351.

Pentecost, season of, 170.

Pepuza, 75.

Periodæta, 301.

Perpetua, martyr, 66-70.

Persia, Christianity in, 3, 136, 153, 291,
 432-3, 538.

"Person," 246.

Peter, St., Apostle, 2-4, 41, 478.

—, bp. of Alexandria, martyr, 150, 189,
 198.

—, bp. of Alexandria, successor of Atha-
 nasius, 253-4, 260-1.

— the Fuller, bp. of Antioch, 507-12,
 514, 566-7.

— Mongus, bp. of Alexandria, 506-11.

Petilian, Donatist, 407-8.

Philip, emperor, 95-6.

—, St., at Hierapolis, 2.

—, of Side, 34, 435.

Philippopolis, council of, 219.

Philo, 38, 89, 110.

Philosophumena, 41-2, 83, 85-6, 101.

Photinians, 254.

Photinus, bp. of Sirmium, 221.

Pilgrimages, 355-7.

Pior, monk, 332.

Pistus, Arian bp., 215.

Platonism, 37-8.

Pliny, correspondence of, with Trajan,
 12-14.

Plotinus, 93.

Pneumatomachi, 255.

Polycarp, bp. of Smyrna, 16, 29-32, 170.

Polycrates, bp. of Ephesus, 71.

Pontifex Maximus, office of, retained by
 Christian emperors, 184, 237; refused
 by Gratian, 280.

Pope, title of, 546.

Porphyry, 93, 206.

Possidius, 407.

Potammon, Egyptian bishop, 210, 217.

Pothinus, bp. of Lyons, 32-3, 72, 154.

Prætextata, 325.

Prætextatus, saying of, as to the bishoprick
 of Rome, 308.

—, bp. of Rouen, 539.

Praxeas, 76, 81, 84-6.

Praylius, bp. of Jerusalem, 417.

Preaching, by laymen, 101; by deacons,
 300; by bishops and presbyters, 399;
 by monks, forbidden, 558.

Predestinarians, 535.

Predestination, Augustine's views on, 425;
 controversy on, 535-7.

Presbyters, 8.

Priscillian, 284-7; his execution, 287; his
 sect, 288, 481.

Primates, 302.

Primian, Donatist, 402.

Proclus, bp. of Constantinople, 435, 439, 455-6, 459.
Prosopon, 246.
 Prosper, 429, 463, 534-5.
 Proterius, bp. of Alexandria, 506.
 Psalmody, 166; in Egyptian monasteries, 335.
 Psychopannychites, 105.
 Pulcheria, empress, 367, 432, 434, 441, 450, 466-73, 506.
 Purgatory, 68.
 Purification, festival of, 568.
 Purpurius, Numidian bishop, 189, 191.

Q.

Quadratus, 19.
 Quartodecimanism (see *Easter*), 30, 70, 349.

R.

Rabula, bp. of Edessa, 456-7.
 Radagaisus, 367.
 Ravenna, residence of emperors at, 306, 367; buildings at, 344; church of, 484; exarchate of, 521.
 Readers, 157.
 Re-baptism, controversy on, 122-5.
 Recared, 542.
 Relics, 190, 270, 316, 353-4, 566.
 Remigius, bp. of Rheims, 497-8.
 Remoboth (monks), 337.
 Reparatus, bp. of Carthage, 527-9.
 Rimini, Council of, 230.
 Rogations, 569.
 Rome, thousandth year of, 96; paganism at, 186, 275-8, 282, 369, 489; monks appear at, 319; siege of, by Alaric, 367-9; by Genseric, 486-8.
 —, Church of, 2; supremacy of its bishops unknown in the first century, 9; not favoured by St. Cyprian, 129; grounds of Roman precedence, 160; advance in the fourth century, 302-3; extent of jurisdiction, 306; bishops judged by the emperor, 297; advance in the fifth century, 477-484; in the sixth century, 544-7; interference of princes in election of bishops, 484, 550; breach with Constantinople, 512; reconciliation, 517.
 Rufinus of Aquileia, an admirer of Origen, 373; his controversy with Jerome, 375-7; objects to Jerome's translation of the Bible, 328; translates Origen *De Principiis*, 376; his death, 377; whether connected with Pelagius? 413.

S.

Sabbath (Saturday), observance of, 169, 349.

Sabellianism, 85-7, 113, 208, 221, 246.
 Sabellius, 85-6, 113.
 Sacrifices, laws against, 183, 185, 237, 281, 368, 489.
 Saints, festivals of, 350; growing reverence for, 356, 565.
 Salvian, 320, 488, 554.
 Sapor, Persian king, 291.
 Sarabaites, monks, 337.
 Saracens, Christianity among, 293, 294, 538.
 Sardica, Council of, 219; canon for appeal to Julius, 297, 304; canons of, 480.
 Saturninus, heretic, 48-9.
 Saxons in Britain, 492.
 Scetis, monks of, 318.
 Scotland, Christianity in, 154, 493, 542-4.
 Scriptures ordered to be destroyed in Diocletian's persecution, 145.
 Secundus, Arian bishop, 206.
 Seleucia, Council of, 231.
 Semiarians, 228; reconciled with the Catholics, 251; again break off communion, 254; called Macedonians, 284; some acknowledged as saints, 256.
 Semipelagianism, 427-8, 534-7.
Sempecta, 564.
Seniores plebis, 190.
 Septuagint version, 102, 328-9.
 Serapion, monk, 385.
 Serapis, temple of, destroyed, 277.
 Sermons, 343. (See *Homilies, Preaching*.)
 Severian, bp. of Gabala, 384-9.
 Severin, apostle of Noricum, 495.
 Severus, Alexander, emperor, 94-5.
 —, Septimius, emperor, 65-6, 99.
 —, bp. of Antioch, 514-6, 523.
 —, Sulpicius, 360-2.
 Sibylline oracles, 25, 27, 187.
 Sidonius Apollinaris, 535.
 Simon Magus, 36, 40-3.
 Simplicius, bp. of Rome, 512.
 —, philosopher, 522.
 Siricius, bp. of Rome, 288, 376, 479; epistle of, to Himerius, 304, 312, 348.
 Sirmium, creeds of, 227.
 Sisinnius, Novatianist bishop, 383.
 Slaves, treatment of, 174; emancipation of, 182, 351.
 Socrates, historian, 121, 435.
 Sophia, St., Church of, 521-2.
 Soter, bp. of Rome, 70.
 Spain, Church of, 2, 153, 541-2.
 Spectacles, heathen, forbidden, 175.
 Sponsors at baptism, 65.
 State, relations of, with the Church, 294-9, 548-551.
 Stephen, bp. of Antioch, 219, 220.
 — I., bp. of Rome, 122-4.
 Stilicho, 307, 404.
 Stylites, 338-341.
 Subdeacons, 157.
Subintroductæ, 312.
 Suburbicarian churches, 305.
 Suevi, 490, 541-2.

Sunday, celebration of, 166, 169, 183, 349.
 Sylverius, bp. of Rome, 524.
 Sylvester, bp. of Rome, 204.
Symbola (creeds), 163.
 Symbols, Christian, 172; accommodation of heathen to Christianity, 173.
 Symeon, bp. of Jerusalem, 5, 11.
 —, Persian bishop, 291.
 —, Stylite, 338, 452, 506, 538.
 Symmachus, bp. of Rome, 514, 548-9.
 —, Pagan orator, 279, 280, 485.
 —, father-in-law of Boëthius, 520.
 —, translator of the Old Testament, 102, 105.
 Synesius, bp. of Ptolemais, 299, 388.
 Synods, 159, 302, 556, &c. (See *Councils*.)

T.

Tabenne, monastery of, 316.
 Tacitus, emperor, 142.
 Tatian, 28, 34.
 Taxes, clergy exempt from some, 182, 307.
 Telemachus, monk, 371.
 Temples, how dealt with, 186, 275-6-8, 344, 369, 371.
 Tertullian, 11, 14, 122, 127, 152, 155, 175, 177, 179, 410; account of, 77-81; opposes Praxeas, 81, 84.
 Tertullianists, 81.
 Thaddeus, St., 3.
 Theban Legion, 144.
 Thebuthis, 46.
 Themistius, 251.
 Theoctistus, bp. of Cæsarea, 101, 103.
 Theodora, empress, 523-7.
 Theodore, Ascidas, 525-6.
 —, bp. of Mopsuestia, 413, 419-420, 437-8; controversies respecting his memory, 456, 525-9.
 Theodoret, bp. of Cyrus, 443-4; writes against Cyril, 443; accepts Cyril's explanations, 453-4; writes the *Eranistes*, 459; is persecuted by Dioscorus, *ib.*; condemned at the Latrocinium, 465; acknowledged by Leo, 467; appears at Chalcedon, and recovers his see, 473; controversy as to his memory, 525-9.
 Theodoric, Gothic king of Italy, 517-520, 548-9; laws against paganism, 489.
 Theodosius I., emperor, 254, 274, 330, 336, 354, 379; is baptised, 260; his edicts for orthodoxy, *ib.*, 283-4; summons the Second General Council, 262; his relations with St. Ambrose, 271-2; his forgiveness of Antioch, 273; law as to asylum, 299; his penance, 273; measures against paganism, 276-281; scene with a bishop, 283; said to have put the acceptance of Christianity to the vote of the senate, 282; death, 275; apotheosis, 282.
 — II., emperor, 299, 300, 367, 394;

character of, 432; war with Persia, 433; summons the Third General Council, 444; letter to Cyril, *ib.*; interview with Dalmatius, 449; breaks up the Council, 451; labours for peace, 452-6; favours Eutyches, 462; approves of the *Latrocinium*, 465; death of, 466.
 Theodotus, heretic, 83.
 Theognis, Arian bishop, 206.
 Theonas, Arian bishop, 206-8.
 Theopaschites, 515.
 Theophilus, Arian missionary, 290.
 —, bp. of Alexandria, 277-8, 440; his character, 384; behaviour as to Origen, *ib.*, 388; persecutes the Long Brothers, 385; consecrates Chrysostom, 380; attacks him and obtains his banishment, 386-390; writes against him, 393.
 —, bp. of Antioch, 340.
 Theophilus, bp. of the Goths, 292.
Theotokos, 438.
 Therapeutæ, 176.
 Thessalonica, vicariate of, 479; massacre at, 273.
 Thomas, St., Apostle, 3; Christians of, 3, 538.
 Three Articles, controversy respecting, 526.
 Thrasimund, 503.
 Thundering Legion, 28.
 Tichonius, Donatist, 402.
 Timothy, bp. of Alexandria (4th cent.), 263.
 —, Ælurus, bp. of Alexandria, 506.
 —, Salophaciolus, bp. of Alexandria, 507-9.
 —, bp. of Constantinople, 515-6.
 Tithes, 161, 307, 555.
 Toledo, Third Council of, 542, 552.
 Toleration, purchased by Christians, 65; opinions of the fathers on, 288.
 Totila, 521, 564.
 Trades, forbidden, 175.
 Trading forbidden to the clergy, 161, 307.
 Traditors, 146, 189.
 Traducianism, 419.
 Trajan, emperor, 11, 16, 19; correspondence of, with Pliny, 12-4, 19.
 Translation of bishops forbidden, 263, 308.
 Trinity, doctrine of the, 201.
 Trisagion, 514.
 Trophimus, 482.
 Typasa, confessors of, 502.
 Tyre, Council at, 209.

U.

Ulilas, 292-3.
 Ulpian, 95.
 Ursacius, bp. of Singidunum, 220-3, 227, 230, 253.
 Ursicinus, or Ursinus, 252, 305, 308.

V.

- Valens, bp. of Mursa, 220-3, 227, 230-1, 253.
 —, emperor, 250, 276, 294; becomes Arian, 251; persecutes the Catholics, 252-3; and the monks, 253; admits the Goths into the empire, 292-3; scenes with St. Basil, 258; death, 254.
 Valentinian I., emperor, 250-4, 308, 401.
 — II., 254, 268, 271-4, 280-1.
 — III., 432-4, 466; law of, in favour of the Roman See, 482.
 Valentinians, 241, 272.
 Valentinus, heretic, 30, 39, 52-8, 81, 90.
 Valerian, emperor, 97-8, 125-6.
 Valerius, bp. of Hippo, 399.
 Vandals invade Africa, 430; sack Rome, 486; converted to Arianism, 490; persecute the Catholics, 498-504; conquered by Belisarius, 503, 520.
 Vestal virgins, 279, 281.
 Victor, bp. of Rome, 71-2, 76.
 —, bp. of Vite, 498, 502.
 Victory, altar of, 279.
 Vienne, martyrs of, see *Lyons*.
 Vigilantius, 360-2.
 Vigilius, bp. of Rome, 524; condemns Origen, 525; goes to Constantinople, 527; his conduct in the "Three Articles" controversy, 527-30, 550.
 —, bp. of Tapsus, 504.
 Vincent, of Lerins, 491, 534.
 Virgin, the Blessed, honour paid to, 354, 567; Augustine's opinion respecting her, 423. (See *Theotokos*.)
 Virgins, 177; extravagant praises of virginity, 324-5.

Vitalian, 516.

Vitalis, Apollinarian bishop, 265.

W.

- Wales, Christianity in, 492, 542.
 Western Empire, fall of, 487.
 Whitsunday, 163, 170.
 Worship of the early Church, 166; in the fourth century, 341.
 Wulfilaich, Stylite, 341.

X.

- Xystus II., bp. of Rome, 98, 124.
 — III., 420.

Y.

- Yezdegerd, Persian king, 433.

Z.

- Zeno, emperor, 507-12, 517, 545, 567; intercedes for African Catholics, 499; publishes his Henoticon, 509; suppresses the school of Edessa, 457.
 Zenobia, 130-2.
 Zephyrinus, bp. of Rome, 83-5, 101.
 Zosimus, bp. of Rome, 482; favours Pelagius and Cœlestius, 417; changes his policy, 418; his circular, *ib.*; its effect, 479; his correspondence as to Apiarius, 480.

END OF VOL. I.

41873

BR Robertson, James Craigie, 1813-1882.
162 History of the Christian church. London,
R6 J. Murray, 1856-66 [v.1, 1858]
1858 3v. 23cm.
V.1
Vol.1: 2d ed.

1. Church history. I. Title.

CCSC/mmb

A11567 V.1

A11567
V.1

